Presented to the
LIBRARY *of the*
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
by
ESTATE OF THE LATE
MARY SINCLAIR

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/christianliterat03newyuoft

THE

MAGAZINE

OF

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

VOL. III.

OCTOBER, 1890, TO MARCH, 1891.

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE CO.,
35 BOND STREET,
NEW YORK.

LIBRARY
JUN 29 1966
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

1089029

BR
1
C635
v.3

INDEX TO VOLUME III.

SUBJECTS.

PAGE
American Board, The 139
Anglo-Catholicism and the Church 414
Baptism, Is Infant, Declining? 65, 167
Biblical Research 294
Bishop of Lincoln's Case, Editorials on the, in the representative London Church of England Newspapers 252
Booth, Catherine 175
Booth's, General, Scheme of Social Reform 184
Brace, Charles Loring, the Children's Friend 52
Briggs, Professor, and His Critics 430
Calvinism and the Bible 54
Catholics and the Public Schools 143
Century, A, of Revivals 367
Christianity for Six Months 51
Christianity in the Home 356
Christian Missions in Our Time 354
Christian Social Life 190
Christ's Humiliation 147
Church Choirs 47
"Church Support" Symposium 69, 150, 224, 306
Church, The Late Dean 340, 347
Czar's, The Judenhetze 358
Death, The, of a Master of Style 219
Dexter, Henry Martyn 209, 211
Did Luther Commit Suicide? 161
Discovery of an Early Christian House at Rome 45
Do Our Foreign Missionaries Live in Luxury? 302
Elections, The, in Japan, in Relation to Christianity 356
Endeavor—What? 304
Good Tidings of Great Joy, The 299
Hindoo Conservatism 397
Home Missionary's Hardships, A 293
How To Be a Good Hearer 140
How to Get Rid of the Pastor 67
Huntington, Bishop, on "Social Problems and the Church" 207
Imagination in Dealing with Christian Doctrine 86
Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture, The 258
Infant Salvation, The Development of the Doctrine of 321
International and Independent System of Sunday-School Lessons 288
In the Beginning was the Word 335
Japan, The Imperial Diet of 350
Jesus Christ, The, of the Koran 291
Jews in Russia, The 113
King's Daughters, The Origin and Scope of 360
Liberty and Oppression 58
Libraries, The, of Rome 402

PAGE
Liddon, H. P. 68, 102, 130
Liddon's Will 295
Lights of the Church and the Light of Science 1
Literary Department 71, 151, 232, 311, 375
Loyalty and Christian Endeavor 362
Ministry in Cities 81
Ministry, The, Required by the Age 200, 269
Modern Exaggerations of the Divine Immanence 276
Month's Mind 226, 307, 370
Mosaic Legislation, The 31
Much-Admired Preachers 63
New Bible Needed, A 221
Newer History of the Older World, The 145
Newman and Döllinger Contrasted 148
Newman, Cardinal, and His Contemporaries 20
Newman, Cardinal, Leo XIII., and Louvain 404
New, The, Situation in France 401
Ober-Ammergau after the "Passion's Spiel" 284
Old Catholic Congress, The First International 204
Old Lights and New 11
Paradox of Life and Death, The 40
Paragraphic 231, 311
Preacher, The, and His Work 399
Present Crisis, The 365
Rank in Heaven 56
Real Issue, The 364
Recent Corroborations of Scripture 93
Recent Explorations in Palestine 385
Religion *vs.* the Bible 49
Roman Catholic Church? Is There a 212, 273
Romanists on Ritualists 134
Russian Edict Against the Jews 62
Sanctity, The, of the Body 411
Seventeen Reasons Why I am a Unitarian 391
Socialism and the Bible 241
Social Life Among the Assyrians and Babylonians 194
Some Aspects of Newman's Influence 107
Some Plain Words on Christian Living 168
Strange Theological School, A 217
Sunday-School Proprieties 66
Temperance, A German View of 222
Trials, The, of Youth 248
Two Legends of Döllinger's End, The 132
Unconscious Creed Revision 60
Union Movement, The Present Stage of the 301
Uplifted Gaze, The 215
Zöckler's Statistics of Christianity 349

AUTHORS.

PAGE
Alexander, William 154
Armstrong, George D 236, 444
Augustus 136
Bailey, G. S 167
Baird, Henry M 76
Baring-Gould, S 45
Bonnell, Charles R 69
Bottome, Mrs. Margaret 360
Bowne, Borden P 152, 443
Brown, Charles Rufus 236
Burnham, Sylvester 288
Butler, Josephine 175
Carpenter, Rt. Rev. William Boyd 40, 411
Chambers, T. W 234
Coxe, A. C 148
Crosby, Howard 143, 313
Cuyler, Theodore L 356
Dale, R. W 200, 269
Dawson, Sir J. William 11
Dods, Marcus 248
E. B 63
Fairbairn, Principal A. M 414
Fairbanks, Henry 139
Fausset, Canon A. R 186
Francis, J. W. Doane 362
Gerhart, E. V 377
Gilbert, George H 236
Gillett, C. R 157, 232, 237, 314, 316, 375, 380, 445
Gilmore, George W. 378
Gladden, Washington 241
Gladstone, W. E 31, 93, 258
Gordon, A. J 215
Graves, Frederick Burrill 52
Hale, Edward Everett 81
Hall, John 304
Harris, George 442
Harris, H. Richard 151, 379
Hastings, Thomas S 155, 446
Hay, Charles A 232
Hodge, George Woolsey 306
Holland, Canon Henry Scott 102
Huntington, W. R 299
Hutton, M. H 76, 446
Huxley, Thomas H. 1

PAGE
Imbrie, William 350
Judson, Edward 56
Kedney, John Steinfort 71, 86, 156
Kirkus, W 75, 314
Lanin, E. B 113
Lea, Henry C 212, 273
Lloyd, Arthur 335
Lowell, Josephine Shaw 442
Loyson, Madame Hyacinthe 204
McConnell, S. D 234
Maccoll, Canon Malcom 340
Macleod, Norman 168
Macmillan, Hugh 190
Mann, N. M 391
Merrill, Selah 385
Meynell, Wilfrid 20
Mivart, St. George 404
Moore, Edward C 232
Moore, W. W 152
Osgood, Howard 145
Paine, Levi L 72
Parker, Joseph 399
Pinches, Theodore G 294
Porter, E. G 302
Sage, A. J 367
Sayce, Professor 194, 296
Schaff, Philip 161, 312, 402
Shedd, W. G. T 54
Smith, Henry Preserved 376
Smith, Judson H 376
Smyth, Newman 60
Spurgeon, C. H. 147, 365
Storrs, R. S 211, 354
Strong, Augustus H 276
Taylor, William M 140
Todd, E. S 47
Tucker, J. T 217
Tyler, B. B 301
Van de Water, George R 150
Ward, Julius H 153, 347
Ward, Wilfrid 107
Warfield, B. B 321
Wray, Newton 224
Zwemer, S. M 291

THE
MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 3. OCTOBER, 1890. No. 1.

THE LIGHTS OF THE CHURCH AND THE LIGHT OF SCIENCE.

BY PROFESSOR THOMAS H. HUXLEY.

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), July, 1890.

THERE are three ways of regarding any account of past occurrences, whether delivered to us orally or recorded in writing.

The narrative may be exactly true. That is to say, the words taken in their natural sense, and interpreted according to the rules of grammar, may convey to the mind of the hearer, or of the reader, an idea precisely correspondent with one which would have remained in the mind of a witness. For example, the statement that King Charles the First was beheaded at Whitehall on the 30th day of January, 1649, is as exactly true as any proposition in mathematics or physics; no one doubts that any person of sound faculties, properly placed, who was present at Whitehall throughout that day, and who used his eyes, would have seen the King's head cut off; and that there would have remained in his mind an idea of that occurrence which he would have put into words of the same value as those which we use to express it.

Or the narrative may be partly true and partly false. Thus, some histories of the time tell us what the King said, and what Bishop Juxon said; or report royalist conspiracies to effect a rescue; or detail the motives which induced the chiefs of the Commonwealth to resolve that the King should die. One account declares that the King knelt at a high block, another that he lay down with his neck on a mere plank. And there are contemporary pictorial representations of both these modes of procedure. Such narratives, while veracious as to the main event, may and do exhibit various degrees of unconscious and conscious misrepresentation, suppression, and invention, till they become hardly distinguishable from pure fictions. Thus, they present a transition to narratives of a third class, in which the fictitious element predominates. Here, again, there are all imaginable gradations, from such works as Defoe's quasi-historical account of the Plague year, which probably gives a truer conception of that dreadful time than any authentic history, through the historical novel, drama and epic, to the purely phantasmal creations of imaginative genius, such as the old *Arabian Nights* or the modern *Shaving of Shagpat.* It is not strictly needful for my present purpose that I should say anything about narratives which are professedly fictitious. Yet it may be well, perhaps, if I disclaim any intention of derogating from their value, when I insist upon the paramount necessity of recollecting that there is no sort of relation between the ethical, or the æsthetic, or even the scientific importance of such works, and their worth as historical documents. Unquestionably, to the poetic artist, or even to the student of psychology, *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* may be better instructors than all the books of a wilderness of professors of æsthetics or moral philosophy. But, as evidence of occurrences in Denmark, or in Scotland, at the times and places indicated, they are out of court; the profoundest admiration for them, the deepest gratitude for their influence, are consistent with the knowledge that, historically speaking, they are worthless fables, in which any foundation of reality that may exist is submerged beneath the imaginative superstructure.

At present, however, I am not concerned to dwell upon the importance of fictitious literature and the immensity of the work which it has effected in the education of the human race. I propose to deal with the much more limited inquiry: Are there two other classes of consecutive narratives (as distinct from statements of individual facts), or only one? Is there any known historical work which is throughout exactly true, or is there not? In the case of the great majority of histories the answer is not doubtful: they are all only partially true. Even those venerable works which bear the names of some of the greatest of ancient Greek and Roman writers, and which have been accepted by generation after generation, down to modern times, as stores of unquestionable truth, have been compelled by scientific criticism, after a long battle, to descend to the common level, and to confess to a large admixture of error. I might fairly take this for granted; but it may be well that I should entrench myself behind the very apposite words of an historical authority who is certainly not obnoxious to even a suspicion of sceptical tendencies.

> Time was—and that not very long ago—when all the relations of ancient authors concerning the old world were received with a ready belief; and an unreasoning and uncritical faith accepted with equal satisfaction the narrative of the campaigns of Cæsar and of the doings of Romulus, the account of Alexander's marches and of the conquests of Semiramis. We can most of us remember when, in this country, the whole story of regal Rome, and even the legend of the Trojan settlement in Latium, were seriously placed before boys as history, and discoursed of as unhesitatingly and in as dogmatic a tone as the tale of the Catiline Conspiracy or the Conquest of Britain. . . .
>
> But all this is now changed. The last century has seen the birth and growth of a new science—the science of Historical Criticism. . . . The whole world of profane history has been revolutionised. . . .*

If these utterances were true when they fell from the lips of a Bampton lecturer in 1859, with how much greater force do they appeal to us now, when the immense labours of the generation now passing away constitute one vast illustration of the power and fruitfulness of scientific methods of investigation in history, no less than in all other departments of knowledge.

At the present time, I suppose, there is no one who doubts that histories which appertain to any other people than the Jews, and their spiritual progeny in the first century, fall within the second class of the three enumerated. Like Goethe's Autobiography, they might all be entitled "Wahrheit und Dichtung"—"Truth and Fiction." The proportion of the two constituents changes indefinitely; and the quality of the fiction varies through the whole gamut of unveracity. But "Dichtung" is always there. For the most acute and learned of historians cannot remedy the imperfections of his sources of information; nor can the most impartial wholly escape the influence of the "personal equation" generated by his temperament and by his education. Therefore, from the narratives of Herodotus to those set forth in yesterday's *Times*, all history is to be read subject to the warning that fiction has its share therein. The modern vast development of fugitive literature cannot be the unmitigated evil that some do vainly say it is, since it has put an end to the popular delusion of less press-ridden times, that what appears in print must be true. We should rather hope that some beneficent influence may create among the erudite a like healthy suspicion of manuscripts and inscriptions, however ancient; for a bulletin may lie, even though it be written in cuneiform characters. Hotspur's starling, that was to be taught to speak nothing but "Mortimer" into the ears of King Henry the Fourth, might be a useful inmate of every historian's library, if "Fiction" were substituted for the name of Harry Percy's friend.

But it was the chief object of the lecturer to the congregation gathered in St. Mary's, Oxford, thirty-one years ago, to prove to them, by evidence gathered with no little labour and marshalled with much skill, that one group of historical works was exempt from the general rule; and that the narratives contained in the canonical Scriptures are free from any admixture of error. With justice and candour, the lecturer impresses upon his hearers that the special distinction of Christianity, among the religions of the world, lies in its claim to be historical; to be surely founded upon events which have happened, exactly as they are declared to have happened in its sacred books; which are true, that is, in the sense that the statement about the execution of Charles the First is true. Further, it is affirmed that the New Testament presupposes the historical exactness of the Old Testament; that the points of contact of "sacred" and "profane" history are innumerable; and that the demonstration of the falsity of the Hebrew records, especially in regard to those narratives which are assumed to be true in the New Testament, would be fatal to Christian theology.

My utmost ingenuity does not enable me to discover a flaw in the argument thus briefly summarised. I am fairly at a loss to comprehend how any one, for a moment, can doubt that Christian theology must stand or fall with the historical trustworthiness of the Jewish Scriptures. The very conception of the Messiah, or Christ, is inextricably interwoven with Jewish history; the identification of Jesus of Nazareth with that Messiah rests upon the interpretation of passages of the Hebrew Scriptures which have no evidential value unless they possess the historical character assigned to them. If the covenant with Abraham was not made; if circumcision and sacrifices were not ordained by Jahveh; if the "ten words" were not written by God's hand on the stone tables; if Abraham is more or less a mythical hero, such as Theseus; the story of the Deluge a fiction; that of the Fall a legend; and that of the Creation the dream of a seer; if all these definite and detailed narratives of apparently real events have no more value as history than have the stories of the regal period of Rome—what is to be said about the Messianic doctrine, which is so much less clearly enunciated? And what about the authority of the writers of the books of the New Testament, who, on this theory, have not merely accepted flimsy fictions for solid truths, but have built the very foundations of Christian dogma upon legendary quicksands?

---

* *Bampton Lectures* (1859), on "The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture records stated anew, with Special Reference to the Doubts and Discoveries of Modern Times," by the Rev. G. Rawlinson, M.A., pp. 5–6.

But these may be said to be merely the carpings of that carnal reason which the profane call common sense; I hasten, therefore, to bring up the forces of unimpeachable ecclesiastical authority in support of my position. In a sermon preached last December, in St. Paul's Cathedral,* Canon Liddon declares:

> For Christians it will be enough to know that our Lord Jesus Christ set the seal of His infallible sanction on the whole of the Old Testament. He found the Hebrew Canon as we have it in our hands to-day, and He treated it as an authority which was above discussion. Nay more: He went out of His way—if we may reverently speak thus—to sanction not a few portions of it which modern scepticism rejects. When He would warn His hearers against the dangers of spiritual relapse He bids them remember "Lot's wife." † When He would point out how worldly engagements may blind the soul to a coming judgment, He reminds them how men ate and drank, and married, and were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the Flood came and destroyed them all.‡ If He would put His finger on a fact in past Jewish history which, by its admitted reality, would warrant belief in His own coming Resurrection, He points to Jonah's being three days and three nights in the whale's belly (p. 23).§

The preacher proceeds to brush aside the common—I had almost said vulgar—apologetic pretext that Jesus was using *ad hominem* arguments, or "accommodating" his better knowledge to popular ignorance, as well as to point out the inadmissibility of the other alternative, that he shared the popular ignorance. And to those who hold the latter view sarcasm is dealt out with no niggard hand.

> But they will find it difficult to persuade mankind that, if He could be mistaken on a matter of such strictly religious importance as the value of the sacred literature of His countrymen, He can be safely trusted about anything else. The trustworthiness of the Old Testament is, in fact, inseparable from the trustworthiness of our Lord Jesus Christ; and if we believe that He is the true Light of the world, we shall close our ears against suggestions impairing the credit of those Jewish Scriptures which have received the stamp of His Divine authority (p. 25).

Moreover, I learn from the public journals that a brilliant and sharply-cut view of orthodoxy, of like hue and pattern, was only the other day exhibited in that great theological kaleidoscope, the pulpit of St. Mary's, recalling the time so long passed by, when a Bampton lecturer, in the same place, performed the unusual feat of leaving the faith of old-fashioned Christians undisturbed.

Yet many things have happened in the intervening thirty-one years. The Bampton lecturer of 1859 had to grapple only with the infant Hercules of historical criticism; and he is now a full-grown athlete, bearing on his shoulders the spoils of all the lions that have stood in his path. Surely a martyr's courage, as well as a martyr's faith, is needed by any one who, at this time, is prepared to stand by the following plea for the veracity of the Pentateuch:—

> Adam, according to the Hebrew original, was for 243 years contemporary with Methuselah, who conversed for a hundred years with Shem. Shem was for fifty years contemporary with Jacob, who probably saw Jochebed, Moses's mother. Thus, Moses might by oral tradition have obtained the history of Abraham, and even of the Deluge, at third hand; and that of the Temptation and the Fall at fifth hand. . . .
>
> If it be granted—as it seems to be—that the great and stirring events in a nation's life will, under ordinary circumstances, be remembered (apart from all written memorials) for the space of 150 years, being handed down through five generations, it must be allowed (even on mere human grounds) that the account which Moses gives of the Temptation and the Fall is to be depended upon, if it passed through no more than four hands between him and Adam.*

If "the trustworthiness of our Lord Jesus Christ" is to stand or fall with the belief in the sudden transmutation of the chemical components of a woman's body into sodium chloride, or on the "admitted reality" of Jonah's ejection, safe and sound, on the shores of the Levant, after three days' sea-journey in the stomach of a gigantic marine animal, what possible pretext can there be for even hinting a doubt as to the precise truth of the longevity attributed to the Patriarchs? Who that has swallowed the camel of Jonah's journey will be guilty of the affectation of straining at such an historical gnat—nay midge—as the supposition that the Mother of Moses was told the story of the Flood by Jacob; who had it straight from Shem; who was on friendly terms with Methuselah; who knew Adam quite well?

---

* *The Worth of the Old Testament*, a Sermon preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on the Second Sunday in Advent, Dec. 8, 1889, by H. P. Liddon, D.D., D.C.L., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. Second edition, revised and with a new preface. 1890.

† St. Luke xvii. 32. ‡ *Ibid.* 27. § St. Matt. xii. 40.

* *Bampton Lectures*, 1859, pp. 50–51.

Yet, by the strange irony of things, the illustrious brother of the divine who propounded this remarkable theory, has been the guide and foremost worker of that band of investigators of the records of Assyria and of Babylonia, who have opened to our view, not merely a new chapter, but a new volume of primeval history, relating to the very people who have the most numerous points of contact with the life of the ancient Hebrews. Now, whatever imperfections may yet obscure the full value of the Mesopotamian records, everything that has been clearly ascertained tends to the conclusion that the assignment of no more than 4000 years to the period between the time of the origin of mankind and that of Augustus Cæsar, is wholly inadmissible. Therefore, that Biblical chronology, which Canon Rawlinson trusted so implicitly in 1859, is relegated by all serious critics to the domain of fable.

But if scientific method, operating in the region of history, of philology, of archæology, in the course of the last thirty or forty years, has become thus formidable to the theological dogmatist, what may not be said about scientific method working in the province of physical science? For, if it be true that the Canonical Scriptures have innumerable points of contact with civil history, it is no less true that they have almost as many with natural history; and their accuracy is put to the test as severely by the latter as by the former. The origin of the present state of the heavens and the earth is a problem which lies strictly within the province of physical science; so is that of the origin of man among living things; so is that of the physical changes which the earth has undergone since the origin of man; so is that of the origin of the various races and nations of men, with all their varieties of language and physical conformation. Whether the earth moves round the sun or the contrary; whether the bodily and mental diseases of men and animals are caused by evil spirits or not; whether there is such an agency as witchcraft or not—all these are purely scientific questions; and to all of them the canonical Scriptures profess to give true answers. And though nothing is more common than the assumption* that these books come into conflict only with the speculative part of modern physical science, no assumption can have less foundation.

The antagonism between natural knowledge and the Pentateuch would be as great if the speculations of our time had never been heard of. It arises out of contradiction upon matters of fact. The books of ecclesiastical authority declare that certain events happened in a certain fashion; the books of scientific authority say they did not. As it seems that this unquestionable truth has not yet penetrated among many of those who speak and write on these subjects, it may be useful to give a full illustration of it. And for that purpose I propose to deal, at some length, with the narrative of the Noachian Deluge given in Genesis.

The Bampton lecturer, in 1859, and the Canon of St. Paul's, in 1890, are in full agreement that this history is true, in the sense in which I have defined historical truth. The former is of opinion that the account attributed to Berosus records a tradition—

> not drawn from the Hebrew record, much less the foundation of that record; yet coinciding with it in the most remarkable way. The Babylonian version is tricked out with a few extravagances, as the monstrous size of the vessel and the translation of Xisuthros; but otherwise it is the Hebrew history *down to its minutiæ* (p. 64).

Moreover, correcting Niebuhr, the Bampton lecturer points out that the narrative of Berosus distinctly implies the universality of the Flood.

> It is plain that the waters are represented as prevailing above the tops of the loftiest mountains in Armenia—a height which must have been seen to involve the submersion of all the countries with which the Babylonians were acquainted (p. 66).

I may remark, in passing, that many people think the size of Noah's ark "monstrous," considering the probable state of the art of shipbuilding only 1600 years after the origin of man; while others are so unreasonable as to inquire why the translation of Enoch is less an extravagance than that of Xisuthros. It is more important, however, to note that the universality of the Deluge is recognised, not merely as a part of the story, but as a necessary consequence of some of its details. The latest exponent of Anglican orthodoxy, as we have seen, insists upon the accuracy of the Pentateuchal history of the Flood in a still more forcible manner. It is cited as one of those very narratives to which the authority of the Founder of Christianity is pledged, and upon the accuracy of which "the trustworthiness of our Lord Jesus Christ" is staked, just as others have staked it upon the truth of the histories of demoniac possession in the Gospels.

---

* For example, it appears to me to pervade and vitiate Mr. Wilfrid Ward's argument in the last number of this Review.

Now, when those who put their trust in scientific methods of ascertaining the truth in the province of natural history find themselves confronted and opposed on their own ground by ecclesiastical pretensions to better knowledge, it is, undoubtedly, most desirable for them to make sure that their conclusions, whatever they may be, are well founded. And, if they put aside the unauthorised interference with their business and relegate the Pentateuchal history to the region of pure fiction, they are bound to assure themselves that they do so because the plainest teachings of Nature (apart from all doubtful speculations) are irreconcilable with the assertions which they reject.

At the present time, it is difficult to persuade serious scientific inquirers to occupy themselves, in any way, with the Noachian Deluge. They look at you with a smile and a shrug, and say they have more important matters to attend to than mere antiquarianism. But it was not so in my youth. At that time, geologists and biologists could hardly follow to the end any path of inquiry without finding the way blocked by Noah and his ark, or by the first chapter of Genesis; and it was a serious matter, in this country at any rate, for a man to be suspected of doubting the literal truth of the Diluvial or any other Pentateuchal history. The fiftieth anniversary of the foundation of the Geological Club in 1825, was, if I remember rightly, the last occasion on which the late Sir Charles Lyell spoke to even so small a public as the members of that body. Our veteran leader lighted up once more, and, referring to the difficulties which beset his early efforts to create a rational science of geology, spoke with his wonted clearness and vigour of the social ostracism which pursued him after the publication of the *Principles of Geology*, in 1830, on account of the obvious tendency of that noble work to discredit the Pentateuchal accounts of the Creation and the Deluge. If my younger contemporaries find this hard to believe, I may refer them to a grave book, *On the Doctrine of the Deluge*, published eight years later, and dedicated by its author to his father, the then Archbishop of York. The first chapter refers to the treatment of the "Mosaic Deluge," by Dr. Buckland and Mr. Lyell, in the following terms:

> Their respect for revealed religion has prevented them from arraying themselves openly against the Scriptural account of it—much less do they deny its truth—but they are in a great hurry to escape from the consideration of it, and evidently concur in the opinion of Linnæus, that no proofs whatever of the Deluge are to be discovered in the structure of the earth (p. 1).

And after an attempt to reply to some of Lyell's arguments, which it would be cruel to reproduce, the writer continues :—

> When, therefore, upon such slender grounds, it is determined, in answer to those who insist upon its universality, that the Mosaic Deluge must be considered a preternatural event, far beyond the reach of philosophical inquiry; not only as to the causes employed to produce it, but also as to the effects most likely to result from it; that determination wears an aspect of scepticism, which, however much soever it may be unintentional in the mind of the writer, yet cannot but produce an evil impression on those, who are already predisposed to carp and cavil at the evidences of Revelation (pp. 8–9).

The kindly and courteous writer of these curious passages is evidently unwilling to make the geologists the victims of general opprobrium by pressing the obvious consequences of their teaching home. One is therefore pained to think of the feelings with which, if he lived so long as to become acquainted with the *Dictionary of the Bible*, he must have perused the article "Noah," written by a dignitary of the Church for that standard compendium and published in 1863. For the doctrine of the universality of the Deluge is therein altogether given up; and I permit myself to hope that a long criticism of the story from the point of view of natural science, with which, at the request of the learned theologian who wrote it, I supplied him, may have in some degree contributed towards this happy result.

Notwithstanding diligent search, I have been unable to discover that the universality of the Deluge has any defender left, at least among those who have so far mastered the rudiments of natural knowledge as to be able to appreciate the weight of evidence against it. For example, when I turned to the *Speaker's Bible*, published under the sanction of high Anglican authority, I found the following judicial and judicious deliverance, the skilful wording of which may adorn, but does not hide, the completeness of the surrender of the old teaching :—

> Without pronouncing too hastily on any fair inferences from the words of Scripture, we may reasonably say that their most natural interpretation is, that the whole race of man had become grievously corrupted since the faithful had intermingled with the ungodly; that the inhabited

> world was consequently filled with violence, and that God had decreed to destroy all mankind except one single family; that, therefore, all that portion of the earth, perhaps as yet a very small portion, into which mankind had spread was overwhelmed by water. The ark was ordained to save one faithful family; and lest that family, on the subsidence of the waters, should find the whole country round them a desert, a pair of all the beasts of the land and of the fowls of the air were preserved along with them, and along with them went forth to replenish the now desolated continent. The words of Scripture (confirmed as they are by universal tradition) appear at least to mean as much as this. They do not necessarily mean more.[*]

In the third edition of Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature* (1876), the article "Deluge," written by my friend, the present distinguished head of the Geological Survey of Great Britain, extinguishes the universality doctrine as thoroughly as might be expected from its authorship; and, since the writer of the article "Noah" refers his readers to that entitled "Deluge," it is to be supposed, notwithstanding his generally orthodox tone, that he does not dissent from its conclusions. Again, the writers in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie* (Bd. X. 1882) and in Riehm's *Handwörterbuch* (1884)—both works with a conservative leaning—are on the same side; and Diestel,[†] in his full discussion of the subject, remorselessly rejects the universality doctrine. Even that staunch opponent of scientific rationalism—may I say rationality—Zöckler,[‡] flinches from a distinct defence of the thesis, any opposition to which, well within my recollection, was howled down by the orthodox as mere "infidelity." All that, in his sore straits, Dr. Zöckler is able to do, is to pronounce a faint commendation upon a particularly absurd attempt at reconciliation, which would make out the Noachian Deluge to be a catastrophe which occurred at the end of the Glacial Epoch. This hypothesis involves only the trifle of a physical revolution of which geology knows nothing; and which, if it secured the accuracy of the Pentateuchal writer about the fact of the Deluge, would leave the details of his account as irreconcilable with the truths of elementary physical science as ever. Thus I may be permitted to spare myself and my readers the weariness of a recapitulation of the overwhelming arguments against the universality of the Deluge, which they will now find for themselves stated, as fully and forcibly as could be wished, by Anglican and other theologians, whose orthodoxy and conservative tendencies have, hitherto, been above suspicion. Yet many fully admit (and, indeed, nothing can be plainer) that the Pentateuchal narrator means to convey that, as a matter of fact, the whole earth known to him was inundated; nor is it less obvious that, unless all mankind, with the exception of Noah and his family, were actually destroyed, the references to the Flood in the New Testament are unintelligible.

But I am quite aware that the strength of the demonstration that no universal Deluge ever took place has produced a change of front in the army of apologetic writers. They have imagined that the substitution of the adjective "partial" for "universal," will save the credit of the Pentateuch, and permit them, after all, without too many blushes, to declare that the progress of modern science only strengthens the authority of Moses. Nowhere have I found the case of the advocates of this method of escaping from the difficulties of the actual position better put than in the lecture of Professor Diestel to which I have referred. After frankly admitting that the old doctrine of universality involves physical impossibilities, he continues:—

> All these difficulties fall away as soon as we give up the universality of the Deluge, and imagine a *partial* flooding of the earth, say in western Asia. But have we a right to do so? The narrative speaks of "the whole earth." But what is the meaning of this expression? Surely not the whole surface of the earth according to the ideas of *modern* geographers, but, at most, according to the conceptions of the Biblical author. This very simple conclusion, however, is never drawn by too many readers of the Bible. But one need only cast one's eyes over the tenth chapter of Genesis in order to become acquainted with the geographical horizon of the Jews. In the north it was bounded by the Black Sea and the mountains of Armenia; extended toward the east very little beyond the Tigris; hardly reached the apex of the Persian Gulf; passed, then, through the middle of Arabia and the Red Sea; went southward through Abyssinia, and then turned westward by the frontiers of Egypt, and inclosed the easternmost islands of the Mediterranean (p. 11).

The justice of this observation must be admitted, no less than the further remark that, in still earlier times, the pastoral Hebrews very probably had yet more restricted notions of what constituted the "whole earth." Moreover, I, for one, fully agree with Professor Diestel that the motive, or generative incident, of the whole story is to be sought in the occasionally excessive and desolating floods of the Euphrates and Tigris.

Let us, provisionally, accept the theory of a partial deluge, and try to form a clear mental picture of the occurrence. Let us suppose that, for forty days and forty nights, such a vast quantity of water was poured upon the ground that the whole surface of Mesopotamia was covered by water to a depth certainly greater, probably much greater, than fifteen cubits, or twenty feet (Gen. vii. 20). The inundation prevails upon the earth for one hundred and fifty days; and then the flood gradually decreases, until, on the seventeenth day of the seventh month the ark, which had previously floated on its surface, grounds upon the "mountains of Ararat"* (Gen. viii. 34). Then, as Diestel has acutely pointed out (*Sintflut*, p. 13), we are to imagine the further subsidence of the flood to take place so gradually that it was not until nearly two months and a half after this time (that is to say, on the first day of the tenth month) that the "tops of the mountains" became visible. Hence it follows that, if the ark drew even as much as twenty feet of water, the level of the inundation fell very slowly—at a rate of only a few inches a day—until the top of the mountain on which it rested became visible. This is an amount of movement which, if it took place in the sea, would be overlooked by ordinary people on the shore. But the Mesopotamian plain slopes gently, from an elevation of 500 or 600 feet at its northern end, to the sea, at its southern end, with hardly so much as a notable ridge to break its uniform flatness, for 300 to 400 miles. These being the conditions of the case, the following inquiry naturally presents itself: not, be it observed, as a recondite problem, generated by modern speculation, but as a plain suggestion flowing out of that very ordinary and archaic piece of knowledge that water cannot be piled up in a heap like sand; or that it seeks the lowest level. When, after 150 days, "the fountains also of the deep and the windows of heaven were stopped, and the rain from heaven was restrained" (Gen. viii. 2), what prevented the mass of water, several, possibly very many, fathoms deep, which covered, say, the present site of Bagdad, from sweeping seaward in a furious torrent; and, in a very few hours, leaving, not only the "tops of the mountains," but the whole plain, save any minor depressions, bare? How could its subsidence, by any possibility, be an affair of weeks and months?

---

[*] *Commentary on Genesis*, by the Bishop of Ely, p. 77.
[†] *Die Sintflut*, 1876.
[‡] *Theologie und Naturwissenschaft*, ii. 784-791 (1877).

And if this difficulty is not enough, let any one try to imagine how a mass of water several, perhaps very many, fathoms deep, could be accumulated on a flat surface of land rising well above the sea, and separated from it by no sort of barrier. Most people know Lord's Cricket-ground. Would it not be in absurd contradiction to our common knowledge of the properties of water to imagine that, if all the mains of all the water works of London were turned on to it, they could maintain a heap of water twenty feet deep over its level surface? Is it not obvious that the water, whatever momentary accumulation might take place at first, would not stop there, but that it would dash, like a mighty mill-race, southwards down the gentle slope which ends in the Thames? And is it not further obvious, that whatever depth of water might be maintained over the cricket-ground, so long as all the mains poured on to it, anything which floated there would be speedily whirled away by the current, like a cork in a gutter when the rain pours? But if this is so, then it is no less certain that Noah's deeply laden, sailless, oarless, and rudderless craft, if by good fortune it escaped capsizing in whirlpools, or having its bottom knocked into holes by snags (like those which prove fatal even to well-built steamers on the Mississippi in our day), would have speedily found itself a good way down the Persian Gulf, and not long after in the Indian Ocean, somewhere between Arabia and Hindostan. Even if, eventually, the ark might have gone ashore, with other jetsam and flotsam, on the coasts of Arabia, or of Hindostan, or of the Maldives, or of Madagascar, its return to the "mountains of Ararat" would have been a miracle more stupendous than all the rest.

Thus, the last state of the would-be reconcilers of the story of the Deluge with fact is worse than the first. All that they have done is to transfer the contradictions to established truth from the region of science proper to that of common information and common sense. For, really, the assertion that the surface of a body of deep water, to which no addition was made, and which there was nothing to stop from running into the sea, sank at the rate of only a few inches or even feet a day, simply outrages the most ordinary and familiar teachings of every man's daily experience. A child may see the folly of it.

In addition, I may remark that the necessary assumption of the "partial Deluge" hypothesis (if it is confined to Mesopotamia) that the Hebrew writer must have meant low hills when he said "high mountains"—is quite untenable. On the eastern side of the Mesopotamian plain, the snowy peaks of the frontier ranges of Persia are visible from

---

* It is very doubtful if this means the region of the Armenian Ararat. More probably it designates some part, either of the Kurdish range or of its southeastern continuation.

Bagdad,* and even the most ignorant herdsmen in the neighbourhood of "Ur of the Chaldees," near its western limit, could hardly have been unacquainted with the comparatively elevated plateau of the Syrian desert which lay close at hand. But, surely, we must suppose the Biblical writer to be acquainted with the highlands of Palestine and with the masses of the Sinaitic peninsula, which soar more than 8000 feet above the sea, if he knew of no higher elevations; and, if so, he could not well have meant to refer to mere hillocks when he said that "all the high mountains which were under the whole heaven were covered" (Gen. vii. 19). Even the hill-country of Galilee reaches an elevation of four thousand feet; and a flood which covered it could by no possibility have been other than universal in its superficial extent. Water really cannot be got to stand at, say, 4000 feet above the sea-level over Palestine, without covering the rest of the globe to the same height. Even if in the course of Noah's six hundredth year some prodigious convulsion had sunk the whole region inclosed within "the horizon of the geographical knowledge" of the Israelites by that much, and another had pushed it up again, just in time to catch the ark upon "the mountains of Ararat," matters are not much mended. I am afraid to think of what would have become of a vessel so little seaworthy as the ark and of its very numerous passengers, under the peculiar obstacles to quiet flotation which such rapid movements of depression and upheaval would have generated.

Thus, in view, not, I repeat, of the recondite speculations of infidel philosophers, but in the face of the plainest and most commonplace of ascertained physical facts, the story of the Noachian Deluge has no more claim to credit than has that of Deucalion; and, whether it was, or was not, suggested by the familiar acquaintance of its originators with the effects of unusually great overflows of the Tigris and Euphrates, it is utterly devoid of historical truth.

That is, in my judgment, the necessary result of the application of criticism, based upon assured physical knowledge, to the story of the Deluge. And it is satisfactory that the criticism which is based, not upon literary and historical speculations, but on well-ascertained facts in the departments of literature and of history, tends to exactly the same conclusion.

For I find this much agreed upon by all Biblical scholars of repute, that the story of the Deluge in Genesis is separable into at least two sets of statements; and that, when the statements thus separated are recombined in their proper order, each set furnishes an account of the event, coherent and complete within itself, but in some respects discordant with that afforded by the other set. This fact, as I understand, is not disputed. Whether one of these is the work of an Elohist, and the other of a Jehovist narrator; whether the two have been pieced together in this strange fashion because, in the estimation of the compilers and editors of the Pentateuch, they had equal and independent authority, or not; or whether there is some other way of accounting for it, are questions the answer to which do not affect the fact. If possible, I avoid *a priori* arguments. But still, I think it may be urged, without imprudence, that a narrative having this structure is hardly such as might be expected from a writer possessed of full and infallibly accurate knowledge. Once more, it would seem that it is not necessarily the mere inclination of the sceptical spirit to question everything, or the wilful blindness of infidels, which prompts grave doubts as to the value of a narrative thus curiously unlike the ordinary run of veracious histories.

But the voice of archæological and historical criticism still has to be heard; and it gives forth no uncertain sound. The marvellous recovery of the records of an antiquity, far superior to any that can be ascribed to the Pentateuch, which has been effected by the decipherers of cuneiform characters, has put us in possession of a series, once more, not of speculations, but of facts, which have a most remarkable bearing upon the question of the trustworthiness of the narrative of the Flood. It is established that, for centuries before the asserted migration of Terah from Ur of the Chaldees (which, according to the orthodox interpreters of the Pentateuch, took place after the year 2000 B.C.) Lower Mesopotamia was the seat of a civilization in which art and science and literature had attained a development formerly unsuspected, or, if there were faint reports of it, treated as fabulous. And it is also no matter of speculation, but a fact, that the libraries of these people contain versions of a long epic poem, one of the twelve books of which tells a story of a deluge which, in a number of its leading features, corresponds with the story attributed to Berosus, no less than with the story given in Genesis, with curious exactness. Thus, the correctness of Canon Rawlinson's conclusion, cited above, that the story of Berosus was neither drawn from the Hebrew record, nor is the foundation of it, can hardly be questioned. It is highly probable, if not certain, that Berosus relied upon one of the versions (for there seem to have been several) of the old Babylonian epos, extant in his time; and, if that is a reasonable conclusion, why is it unreasonable to believe that the two stories, which the Hebrew compiler has put together in such an inartistic fashion, were ultimately derived from the same source? I say ultimately, because it does not at all follow that the two versions, possibly trimmed by the Jehovistic writer on the one hand, and by the Elohistic on the other, to suit Hebrew requirements, may not have been current among the Israelites for ages. And they may have acquired great authority before they were combined in the Pentateuch.

---

* So Reclus (*Nouvelle Géographie Universelle*, ix. 386), but I find the statement doubted by an authority of the first rank.

Looking at the convergence of all these lines of evidence to the one conclusion—that the story of the Flood in Genesis is merely a Bowdlerized version of one of the oldest pieces of purely fictitious literature extant; that whether this is, or is not, its origin, the events asserted in it to have taken place assuredly never did take place; further, that, in point of fact, the story, in the plain and logically necessary sense of its words, has long since been given up by orthodox and conservative commentators of the Established Church—I can but admire the courage and clear foresight of the Anglican divine who tells us that we must be prepared to choose between the trustworthiness of scientific method and the trustworthiness of that which the Church declares to be Divine authority. For, to my mind, this declaration of war to the knife against secular science, even in its most elementary forms; this rejection without a moment's hesitation of any and all evidence which conflicts with theological dogma, is the only position which is logically reconcilable with the axioms of orthodoxy. If the Gospels truly report that which an incarnation of the God of Truth communicated to the world, then it surely is absurd to attend to any other evidence touching matters about which he made any clear statement, or the truth of which is distinctly implied by his words. If the exact historical truth of the Gospels is an axiom of Christianity, it is as just and right for a Christian to say, Let us "close our ears against suggestions" of scientific critics, as it is for the man of science to refuse to waste his time upon circle-squarers and flat-earth fanatics.

It is commonly reported that the manifesto by which the Canon of St. Paul's proclaims that he nails the colours of the straitest Biblical infallibility to the mast of the ship ecclesiastical, was put forth as a counterblast to *Lux Mundi*; and that the passages which I have more particularly quoted are directed against the essay on "The Holy Spirit and Inspiration" in that collection of treatises by Anglican divines of high standing, who must assuredly be acquitted of conscious "infidel" proclivities. I fancy that rumour must, for once, be right, for it is impossible to imagine a more direct and diametrical contradiction than that between the passages from the sermon cited above and those which follow:

> What is questioned is that our Lord's words foreclose certain critical positions as to the character of Old Testament literature. For example, does His use of Jonah's resurrection as a *type* of His own, depend in any real degree upon whether it is historical fact or allegory? . . . Once more, our Lord uses the time before the Flood, to illustrate the carelessness of men before His own coming. . . . In referring to the Flood He certainly suggests that He is treating it as typical, for He introduces circumstances—"eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage"—which have no counterpart in the original narrative (p. 358–9).

While insisting on the flow of inspiration through the whole of the Old Testament, the essayist does not admit its universality. Here, also, the new apologetic demands a partial flood:

> But does the inspiration of the recorder guarantee the exact historical truth of what he records? And, in matter of fact, can the record, with due regard to legitimate historical criticism, be pronounced true? Now, to the latter of these two questions (and they are quite distinct questions) we may reply that there is nothing to prevent our believing, as our faith strongly disposes us to believe, that the record from Abraham downward is, in substance, in the strict sense historical (p. 351).

It would appear, therefore, that there is nothing to prevent our believing that the record, from Abraham upward, consists of stories in the strict sense unhistorical, and that the pre-Abrahamic narratives are mere moral and religious "types" and parables.

I confess I soon lose my way when I try to follow those who walk delicately among "types" and allegories. A certain passion for clearness forces me to ask, bluntly, whether the writer means to say that Jesus did not believe the stories in question, or that he did? When Jesus spoke, as of a matter of fact, that "the Flood came and destroyed them all," did he believe that the Deluge really took place, or not? It seems to me that, as the narrative mentions Noah's wife, and his sons' wives, there is good scriptural warranty for the statement that the antediluvians married and were given in marriage; and I should have thought that their eating and drinking might be assumed by the firmest believer in the literal truth of the story. Moreover, I venture to ask what sort of value, as an illustration of God's methods of dealing with sin, has an account of an event that never happened? If no Flood swept the careless people away, how is the warning of more worth than the cry of "Wolf" when there is no wolf? If Jonah's three days' residence in the whale is not an "admitted reality," how could it "warrant belief" in the "coming resurrection?" If Lot's wife was not turned into a pillar of salt, the bidding those who turn back from the narrow path to "remember" it is, morally, about on a level with telling a naughty child that a bogy is coming to fetch it away. Suppose that a Conservative orator warns his hearers to beware of great political and social changes, lest they end, as in France, in the domination of a Robespierre; what becomes, not only of his argument, but of his veracity, if he, personally, does not believe that Robespierre existed and did the deeds attributed to him?

Like all other attempts to reconcile the results of scientifically-conducted investigation with the demands of the outworn creeds of ecclesiasticism, the essay on Inspiration is just such a failure as must await mediation, when the mediator is unable properly to appreciate the weight of the evidence for the case of one of the two parties. The question of "Inspiration" really possesses no interest for those who have cast ecclesiasticism and all its works aside, and have no faith in any source of truth save that which is reached by the patient application of scientific methods. The theories of inspiration are speculations as to the means by which the authors of statements, in the Bible or elsewhere, have been led to say what they have said—and it assumes that natural agencies are insufficient for the purpose. I prefer to stop short of this problem, finding it more profitable to undertake the inquiry which naturally precedes it—namely, Are these statements true or false? If they are true, it may be worth while to go into the question of their supernatural generation; if they are false, it certainly is not worth mine.

Now, not only do I hold it to be proven that the story of the Deluge is a pure fiction; but I have no hesitation in affirming the same thing of the story of the Creation.*

Between these two lies the story of the creation of man and woman and their fall from primitive innocence, which is even more monstrously improbable than either of the other two, though, from the nature of the case, it is not so easily capable of direct refutation. It can be demonstrated that the earth took longer than six days in the making, and that the Deluge, as described, is a physical impossibility; but there is no proving, especially to those who are perfect in the art of closing their ears to that which they do not wish to hear, that a snake did not speak, or that Eve was not made out of one of Adam's ribs.

The compiler of Genesis, in its present form, evidently had a definite plan in his mind. His countrymen, like all other men, were doubtless curious to know how the world began; how men, and especially wicked men, came into being, and how existing nations and races arose among the descendants of one stock; and, finally, what was the history of their own particular tribe. They, like ourselves, desired to solve the four great problems of cosmogony, anthropogeny, ethnogeny, and geneogeny. The Pentateuch furnishes the solutions which appeared satisfactory to its author. One of these, as we have seen, was borrowed from a Babylonian fable; and I know of no reason to suspect any different origin for the rest. Now, I would ask, is the story of the fabrication of Eve to be regarded as one of those pre-Abrahamic narratives, the historical truth of which is an open question, in face of the reference to it in a speech unhappily famous for the legal oppression to which it has been wrongfully forced to lend itself?

> Have ye not read, that he which made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; and the twain shall become one flesh? (Matt. xix. 5).

If Divine authority is not here claimed for the twenty-fourth verse of the second chapter of Genesis, what is the value of language? And again, I ask, if one may play fast and loose with the story of the Fall as a "type" or "allegory," what becomes of the foundation of Pauline theology?—

> For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive (1 Corinthians xv. 21, 22).

If Adam may be held to be no more real

---

* So far as I know, the narrative of the Creation is not now held to be true, in the sense in which I have defined historical truth, by any of the reconcilers. As for the attempts to stretch the Pentateuchal days into periods of thousands or millions of years, the verdict of the eminent biblical scholar, Dr. Riehm (*Der biblische Schöpfungsbericht*, 1881, pp. 15, 16), on such pranks of "Auslegungskunst" should be final. Why do the reconcilers take Goethe's advice seriously?—

"Im Auslegen seyd frisch und munter!
Legt ihr's nicht aus, so legt was unter."

a personage than Prometheus, and if the story of the Fall is merely an instructive "type," comparable to the profound Promethean mythus, what value has Paul's dialectic?

While, therefore, every right-minded man must sympathise with the efforts of those theologians, who have not been able altogether to close their ears to the still, small voice of reason, to escape from the fetters which ecclesiasticism has forged, the melancholy fact remains, that the position they have taken up is hopelessly untenable. It is raked alike by the old-fashioned artillery of the Churches and by the fatal weapons of precision with which the *enfants perdus* of the advancing forces of science are armed. They must surrender, or fall back into a more sheltered position. And it is possible that they may long find safety in such retreat.

It is, indeed, probable that the proportional number of those who will distinctly profess their belief in the transubstantiation of Lot's wife, and the anticipatory experience of submarine navigation by Jonah; in water standing fathoms deep on the side of a declivity without anything to hold it up; and in devils who enter swine, will not increase. But neither is there ground for much hope that the proportion of those who cast aside these fictions and adopt the consequence of that repudiation, are, for some generations, likely to constitute a majority. Our age is a day of compromises. The present and the near future seem given over to those happily, if curiously, constituted people who see as little difficulty in throwing aside any amount of post-Abrahamic Scriptural narrative, as the authors of *Lux Mundi* see in sacrificing the pre-Abrahamic stories; and, having distilled away every inconvenient matter of fact in Christian history, continue to pay divine honours to the residue. There really seems to be no reason why the next generation should not listen to a Bampton Lecture modelled upon that addressed to the last:—

> Time was—and that not very long ago—when all the relations of Biblical authors concerning the old world were received with a ready belief; and an unreasoning and uncritical faith accepted with equal satisfaction the narrative of the Captivity and the doings of Moses at the court of Pharaoh, the account of the Apostolic meeting in the Epistle to the Galatians, and of the fabrication of Eve. We can most of us remember when, in this country, the whole story of the Exodus, and even the legend of Jonah, were seriously placed before boys as history, and discoursed of in as dogmatic a tone as the tale of Agincourt or the history of the Norman Conquest.
>
> But all this is now changed. The last century has seen the growth of scientific criticism to its full strength. The whole world of history has been revolutionized and the mythology which embarrassed earnest Christians has vanished as an evil mist, the lifting of which has only more fully revealed the lineaments of infallible Truth. No longer in contact with fact of any kind, Faith stands now and for ever proudly inaccessible to the attacks of the infidel.

So far the apologist of the future. Why not? *Cantabit Vacuus.*

For The Magazine of Christian Literature.

OLD LIGHTS AND NEW.

Being a Comment on Dr. Huxley's Article entitled, "The Lights of the Church and the Light of Science."*

BY SIR J. WILLIAM DAWSON, LL.D., F.R.S., C.M.G., PRINCIPAL OF MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL.

I have been asked to make some remarks on the preceding paper, and I am the more disposed to do so because it bears, though indirectly, on results of my own studies of the narrative of the deluge, which appeared recently in the *Contemporary Review*† and which have been republished in this magazine.‡ It raises also some questions scarcely touched in that paper, and which may to some minds seem important.

Huxley is well known as a man of world-wide reputation in his own specialties, an able promoter of scientific education and of popular intelligence, an independent seeker after truth, and an uncompromising assailant of whatever he regards as false or wrong. He may fall somewhat short of infallibility as an exegetist of Holy Scripture, but he rests his judgment in this, as in other matters, on common sense and scientific methods of reasoning; and his views demand respect not only on their own account, but as expressing those of a large and probably increasing number of educated men and women, and as likely to exert a wide influence in the formation of opinion. In the article in question his attack is directed as much against certain schools of ecclesiastical thought as against the Old and New Testament, and I confess I have little more sympathy than he with the special views of either the High or Broad Churchmen whom he assails, and whom it is scarcely fair to regard as adequate representatives either of Moses or of Christ.

---

* Reprinted in this number from *The Nineteenth Century*, of July, 1890.

† December, 1889.

‡ See January, 1890, pp. 213–222.

On the other hand, I cannot accept his estimate of the scientific value of the so-called higher criticism, of which Robertson Smith, in England, and Wellhausen, in Germany, may be taken as advanced exponents. To me the methods of these men appear to be the reverse of those of legitimate science, inasmuch as they are not inductive, but rather analogical and speculative, while it is their habit to build the most stupendous conclusions on the smallest possible basis of fact or even of plausible conjecture. Their ingenious attempts to invert the pyramid of historical truth and poise it on its apex, would, if applied to any department of natural science, involve it in hopeless confusion and would merit the reprobation of all legitimate scientific workers. Any scientific man who regards such men as rational inquirers like himself, and trusts to them in matters beyond and above his own specialties, is likely to be led far astray. If, therefore, I have to oppose any of the conclusions of the article in question, I would prefer to do so rather as a dissentient from the misleading critical guides, than as an adversary of the genuine scientific students whom they lead astray.

I am entirely at one with Dr. Huxley in holding that the statements as to nature and history in the Bible are to be interpreted just as we would interpret those in any other book. They must be taken as intended for men of ordinary common sense and intelligence, and as meant to be true for every place and for all time. Nay more, they should be tested, not merely as we would the writings of ordinary authorities, but as we would sift the claims of a book dealing with the most momentous issues and professing to come from a pure and infallible source.

I am also in unison with Dr. Huxley in the belief that if the historical trustworthiness of the Hebrew Scriptures can be disproved, the New Testament must fall with them, except in so far as it might remain as a collection of instructive fables, having much beauty and an admirable moral tendency, though the latter would necessarily be impaired by the stigma of false pretensions—a very serious drawback in the minds of men of high honor and moral culture. On the other hand, the unique character and magnificent literary structure of these venerable records, and the inestimable benefits they have conferred and are conferring on mankind, should protect them from captious and unfair treatment, and justify a certain measure of indignation against any who would place them on the rack of a cruel and harsh criticism with the view of extracting from them unfounded confessions of guilt.

Huxley declines to consider the question of inspiration, and is entitled to do so from the standpoint of an agnostic. If he professed to be a theist the case would be different, as on the supposition of a God caring for intelligent creatures, revelation becomes antecedently probable. He, however, makes an admission of a most important character. He is willing to inquire if the statements of the supposed revelation are true or false, and if true to "go into the question of their supernatural generation." This is all that we can ask of an agnostic, so far as references to natural facts are concerned, especially if he is willing to concede, which any reasonable man should be, that some or many of the statements of revelation must, from the nature of the case, be incapable of physical demonstration. We must bear in mind that the only use of revelation would be to make known truths not attainable or not easily attainable by other means. We must not treat the Bible as the Caliph Omar is said to have treated the Alexandrian library, when he decreed that "If the books contain only what is in the Koran they are useless, if anything else then they are false." In other words, we have no right to say, "If the Bible contains only elementary truths on natural science then we have no need of it, if anything not verifiable by natural science it must be untrue."

We should also have distinctly before us two leading facts respecting inspiration which are sometimes tacitly overlooked. First, there must be in it a human as well as a divine element. Our Lord, in His closing address to His disciples, as recorded by John,* clearly defines this. He says that they are to be His witnesses "because they have been with Him from the beginning." In this respect their testimony is merely that of human observation and memory. But He also says that the Holy Spirit will "bring all things to their remembrance" and guide them "into all truth." This is the divine element, or inspiration, properly so called. This authoritative definition of the Master corresponds with that given later by Peter, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."* They were "holy men," incapable of deceit, and desirous of telling the truth for the best ends. They "spake" and that was their own act, but they were "moved"—that is, impelled and guided by God's Spirit. Secondly, revelation must always be imperfect or at least incomplete. Patriarchs and prophets of old knew only parts of the truth up to the requirements and capacities of their own times; and even after all that Christ taught, Paul could say, "We know in part, and we prophesy in part." † Science can be only a very partial and imperfect revealer of natural fact and law, and divine revelation in its own sphere resembles science in this.

---

* John xiv. 26; xv. 26, 27; xvi. 13.

With such limitations, and after the vindication of the essential truth of the statements of the Bible to nature and history, it may, as our author admits, be "worth while" for even an agnostic to look into the evidence of inspiration; and any such good intention on his part should be encouraged in the interest of truth and fair play. In doing so, however, he should take the benefit of his own caution to the advocates of "outworn creeds," and beware of confounding mere speculations with scientific facts and inductions, and of substituting doubtful dogmas of his own for those of "ecclesiasticism."

While writing I am furnished with an additional illustration of the relations of science and revelation by a question asked, not by Dr. Huxley, but by one of the "lights of the Church." ‡ He asks, "What attitude do we suppose our Lord to hold toward the great discoveries in the world of nature which the latter times have revealed—toward the astronomy, the geology, the physics of the present?" and he asks a similar question in relation to our Saviour's critical accuracy in quoting the Old Testament. He answers both in a half-hearted and evasive manner, attributing, in fact, to Jesus an intellectual inferiority and liability to error in such subjects, somewhat similar to the distinction sometimes made between the ordinary and *ex cathedra* utterances of the pope. Such a conclusion seems to me equally at variance with scientific habits of thought and with rational views of inspiration. The sciences referred to relate to physical facts appreciated by our senses and reason, but which we know only as phenomena, the outward appearances of inward realities. Inspiration, if it deals with such things, must penetrate below the superficial phenomena and refer to a First Cause. Science is a screen on which we see projected the shadows of invisible powers. Divine knowledge must necessarily deal with the actor behind the screen. Jesus accordingly shows no knowledge of the technicalities of science ancient or modern, but His statements as to nature often relate to matters lying behind and beyond science. He displays no knowledge or prescience of the critical discussions of the nineteenth century, except as they may be included in His general prophetic warnings against the subtle deceptions of the last times, but He deals with the facts which lie behind such discussions, and with the human subjective elements involved in them. He shows this in His reported controversies with the Sadducees, the representatives in His time of our scientific and critical sceptics. An apposite illustration is afforded by the remarkable conversation recorded in the twenty-second chapter of Matthew's Gospel, on the subject of the reality and conditions of a future life. This passage should be carefully studied by those who would appreciate our Lord's mode of treatment of natural facts and the Old Testament revelation. We may gather from it that if confronted with the modern successors of the Sadducees, He might administer the same mild but comprehensive rebuke, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God." *

In applying to the Bible the tests of natural and historical truth on which he insists, Dr. Huxley takes as his leading example the narrative of the deluge as given in Genesis. Many of the objections which he urges have been met in the paper on this subject already referred to, but he raises some new points, and he brings in incidentally three other portions of Bible history to which the New Testament and our Lord himself are fully committed; viz., the fate of Lot's wife, Jonah's adventure with the great fish, and the demoniacal possession of the Gadarene swine. It may be well first to dispose of these difficulties and to notice the deluge questions later.

The fate of Lot's wife was a tragical one, and affords a warning to be held in remembrance by all backsliders, laggards, and stragglers from the advance of humanity. But it is distressing to think that any one should imagine that the unfortunate woman was subjected to the terrible process of having "the chemical compounds" of her body "converted into sodium chloride." No such statement occurs in Genesis, and I have failed to find it even in the commentators, many of whom seem to vie with each other in the conceits and crudities which they heap on this unfortunate story. Such a statement would be discreditable to an author who is stated to have received a liberal education in the country in which chemistry originated, and from which it takes its name. It would, indeed, if it occurred in Genesis, furnish a stronger argument against the Mosaic authorship of the book than any I have met with.

---

* 2 Peter i. 21. † 1 Cor. xiii. 9, and the Context.
‡ Rev. Canon Travers Smith, "The Expositor," Aug. 1890.

* Matt. xxii. 29.

I have elsewhere* fully commented on the narrative of the destruction of the cities of the plain, and have shown that it must have been originally derived from the testimony of eye-witnesses, and must have been written by an author of much culture and information respecting natural phenomena, and especially those of the region in question. In a bitumen eruption, such as that to which he refers the catastrophe, the ejection of brine would be a very probable accompaniment, especially in the valley of the Salt Sea; and nothing could be more likely than that the bodies of many of those who perished should after the event appear covered with saline matter. The word "pillar" in our version is an unfortunate one, and not a good translation of the original word, which should be rendered "heap" or "pile." The record does not say that Lot's wife was converted into salt, but that she "became a heap or mound of salt;" and the meaning evidently is that instead of being buried in the ordinary way under a cairn of stones, the catastrophe which took her life buried her also under its own deposits. We can imagine the survivors of that dreadful day returning to look for their perished kinswoman, and finding nothing to represent her body but one of those mounds of salt or saline mud which, according to the testimony of the Book of Deuteronomy, covered the once fertile plain.† The connection of Lot's wife by mediæval and modern travellers with the old salt cliffs of Jebel Usdum at the other end of the Dead Sea is perfectly absurd, and, though it may have had some connection with the translation "pillar" in the English version, cannot have been in the mind of the original writer, who shows himself well acquainted with the locality, and who must have known that the salt cliffs at the south end of the sea were there before the cities of the plain were built. From a scientific point of view, however, it is interesting to note that the ejection of saline water and mud, which often accompanies the destructive bitumen eruptions of North America, and which is implied in the subsequent reference in Deuteronomy, is not mentioned by the writer in Genesis, except in the incidental reference to the fate of Lot's wife, which thus constitutes an additional evidence of the graphic truthfulness of the story.

If, therefore, we are advised in the New Testament to "remember Lot's wife," in view of the necessity of escaping the coming doom of those iniquities, ecclesiastical and civil, which "spiritually are called Sodom and Egypt," there is really no scientific reason to prevent us from accepting the warning. On the contrary, its force should be more keenly felt by the scientific mind, and I should have no hesitation in urging any of my scientific friends who may be in danger of failing to escape from either the unbeliefs or superstitions of this present evil world, to "remember Lot's wife."

The little Book of Jonah, in its revelation of the modes of religious thought in the ancient world, of human nature in general, and of the plans of God, is perhaps, next to the inimitable histories of Ruth and Joseph, the most attractive in the Old Testament; but the entombment of the prophet in the body of the great fish is the fly in the pot of ointment which causes it to have an unpleasant savor in the nostrils of some modern readers. Yet, singularly enough, it afforded to Jesus the best sign which He could give to educated and critical objectors in His time, of the reality of that still greater stumbling-block, His own resurrection.

Much learned industry has been expended in reducing, so to speak, the miraculous character of this episode of Jonah and the fish, by speculating as to the kind of fish intended, whether some kind of whale or shark, and by adducing examples of frogs and rabbits extracted alive out of the stomachs of serpents, and of newts retained in a living state in the stomachs of men. If the object had been to show the natural possibility of Jonah's adventure, Dr. Huxley might have collected from his reading many such examples; but he takes the opposite course in rejecting the story as altogether incredible on physiological grounds. In this, curiously enough, he coincides in his premises, though not in his conclusion, with the miraculous side of the argument. Taking our Lord's reference as an illustration, the more any one can show that the narrative of Jonah is naturally credible and not miraculous, the less apposite will the case be to that of our Lord's resurrection. On the other hand, if any one could show that the residence of a living man in a fish's belly for three days is as impossible as the spontaneous resurrection of a dead man after a similar interval, he would so far vindicate the analogy as stated by Jesus. In this respect Dr. Huxley's position is, if I may so speak, hyperorthodox, or it would be so if he could admit the possibility of a miracle.

---

* "Modern Science in Bible Lands," chap. viii.

† Deut. xxix. 23.

That the author of the Book of Jonah regards the incident as miraculous appears not merely from his not attempting any natural explanation of it, but from his statement that "the Lord had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah." The same expression is used of Jonah's gourd, which the Lord "prepared" or caused to grow for his benefit, of the worm which destroyed the gourd, and of the *kamsin* which vexed the prophet. In all these cases ordinary natural objects are employed, but in a special or miraculous way. Analogy would lead to the inference that the fish might have been of some ordinary species, but miraculously provided for a particular end. The narrative therefore belongs to that class of so-called miracles in which natural energies or objects are employed for special purposes not occurring in the ordinary course of events, but still in accordance with the natural powers belonging to them and the natural laws regulating them.

To understand this, let us suppose that the narrator had said, "There happened accidentally to be a tree drifting by, to which Jonah clung and on which he drifted three days till it was cast ashore." This would have been scarcely more probable than the actual statement, while it would have deprived the incident of all applicability to the resurrection of Jesus, and would have left it uncertain whether Jonah was indebted for his safety to a mere accident or to a miracle. The case would have been slightly different if it had been represented as a natural occurrence, so far as the accidental presence of a cachalot or a basking shark was concerned; but in that case the miracle of the preservation of the prophet would still remain. So, if we are to give any credit to the story, we must fall back on the formula "God prepared." Observe, however, that, even so, it is no more miraculous than Jonah's receiving a commission to preach in Nineveh, or than the storm raised for his special benefit, or the repentance of the Ninevites, or the preparation of the gourd, or the worm, or the hot wind. All of these, if facts, depend on the existence and intervention of a Divine Father of men, using His own natural agencies just as a wise and benevolent man might use the instruments he had prepared, without either explaining or imparting to others the powers he might put forth. Thus all the parts of the story harmonize with each other and with the miracles of the New Testament, and we have no reason to discard either as incredible unless we take the ground of refusing to believe in the miraculous on any evidence whatever—an attitude absurdly unscientific when we consider how much that is easy to one man is miraculous to another, and how vast is the field of the natural and spiritual possibilities that lie beyond the narrow limits of our scientific knowledge.

It is not my purpose here to dwell on the beautiful and touching significance of the Book of Jonah in a spiritual point of view, which commended it to Christ as an emblem of the resurrection, and endeared it to those old Roman Christians who have left so many representations of it on their tombs in the catacombs, and to whom the Christian resurrection was a revelation so great and glorious. We may pass on therefore to the Gadarene swine.

Here it is proper to interpose two objections to the treatment sometimes given to this part of Christ's history. In the first place, what right has any one to sneer at the demonology and angelology of the New Testament as things absurd or incredible, or as late acquisitions of the Hebrews derived from heathen nations? The idea of spiritual beings, good or evil, superior in power and intelligence to man, is one of the most primitive and widely diffused of all religious beliefs, and so consonant to the analogies of our own nature that it is difficult to divest ourselves of it. It may be true that some things, at one time attributed to such intermediate beings, may now be more properly regarded as the results of the direct action of God Himself through His natural energies and laws; but no one can prove that the existence of such beings is either impossible or improbable. On the other hand, the evidence of their existence must necessarily be different from that on which our belief in ordinary material nature is based, though it is not dissimilar to that which is the scientific basis of belief in energies known only by their effects and not at all in their own nature. Secondly, if there are spiritual beings distinct from ourselves, what grounds have we for setting limits to their powers in acting on persons or things, other than those which have been fixed by the laws of God, or, if we prefer so to express it, by the laws of their own nature, which may or may not be known to us? If such beings can, under certain conditions, seize upon the hidden cords which connect the will of man with his brain and body, may they not be equally able to tamper with the brain and nerves of other animals?

This much being premised, we have a right to say that the story of the Gadarene swine is not only one that may be true in fact, but one having a significance and instructive bearing quite peculiar to itself. Let us examine the narrative as given in Mark, which some of our critical friends profess to regard as the primitive gospel.

It was after a long and fatiguing day of teaching and working among excited crowds on the west side of the lake of Gennesaret, that Jesus asked His disciples in the evening to convey Him to the other side in quest of rest and quiet. So, without making any special provision, they take Him as He was, in the boat they had been using—probably one of those flat, broad-sterned boats that one still sees in the East used as ferry-boats. Prostrate with fatigue, Jesus throws Himself on the cushion in the stern of the boat and falls asleep. He is awaked by the appeals of the disciples when the storm bursts on them, and quietly arising commands the wind and the waves to be still and they obey. Mark says on this, "They feared a great fear and said one to another, what manner of man is this?" We may well suppose that even the disciples were forcibly struck with the strange contrast between human weakness and divine power as manifested in the same person. It is well to note, however, that they emphasize the remark that *even* the wind and the sea obey Jesus, while they make no note of surprise at the healing of the demoniac. I confess that, as a student of physical science, I sympathize with them in the distinction.

On arrival at the Gadarene shore disappointment awaits the party in the boat. They are met by a savage demoniac shouting his wild welcome. Jesus, wearied as He was and disappointed of His needed rest, does not shun the encounter. The demons—personal demons and many of them—can only ask for quarter. They beg that they may not be sent out of the district or region, and as they cannot any longer inhabit human hosts that they may be allowed to infest swine. The result was one which perhaps they did not anticipate, or if they did, regarded it as a way of being avenged on Jesus by prepossessing the people against Him. In any case they are successful in this, and Jesus is in His turn desired to depart. So they seem to have gained their point and the Saviour is deprived of His rest and repelled from the country of the Gadarenes and the Province of Decapolis. But evil may be made to work for good. The dispossessed demoniac becomes a missionary and publishes throughout the whole province how great things Jesus had done for him. All men wondered, and we have reason to believe that many were converted to Christianity in Decapolis through the labors of this extemporized missionary. To these people the demoniacal possession was a reality, because they had seen its effects, though the cause may to them have been as inscrutable and as much beyond their control as is the case with many forms of insanity in our own time.

The story is simply told without display or comment, and its credibility must rest on the same grounds with that of other parts of our Lord's history, while its tendency and lessons are of the utmost value to us. Fools may scoff at it, but men of science, who know how much in the domain of non-material causation exists and is still mysterious, should not be willing to throw the first stone.

We now come to the *pièce de resistance* of the article—the story of the deluge. In the paper already referred to I have carefully examined the narrative in Genesis, and have shown its integrity as the statement of a witness of the event, its accordance with natural facts and historical testimony, and its inherent credibility. I shall therefore confine myself to some special points raised in the article now before us, and which did not occur to me as likely to be agitated at the present time.

One of these, and the one most dwelt on, I should, perhaps, apologize for detaining the reader to consider, but trite though it is, the use made of it gives it importance. This is the question of the universality of the deluge. It is obvious that there are four senses in which a catastrophe like the deluge of Noah may be affirmed or denied to have been universal. (1) It may have been universal in the sense of being a deep stratum of water covering the whole globe, both land and sea. Such universality could not have been in the mind of the writer, and probably has been claimed knowingly by no writer in modern times. Halley in the last century understood the conditions of such universality, though he seems to have supposed that the impact of a comet might supply the necessary water. Owen has directed attention to the fact that such a deluge might be as fatal to the inhabitants of the waters as to those of the land. In any case, such universality would demand an enormous supply of water from some extra-terrestrial source. (2) The deluge may have been universal in the sense of being a submersion of the whole of the land, either by subsidence or by elevation of the ocean bed. Such a state of things may have existed in primitive geological ages before our continents were elevated, but we have no scientific evidence of its recurrence at any later time, though large portions of the continents have been again and again submerged. The writers of Genesis (chapter 1) and of Psalm 104 seem to have known of no such total submergence since the elevation of the first dry land, and nothing of this kind is expressed or certainly implied in the deluge story. (3) The deluge may have been universal in so far as man, its chief object, and certain animals useful or necessary to him are concerned. This kind of universality would seem to have been before the mind of the writer, when he says that "Noah only" and they who were with him in the ark remained alive.* (4) The deluge may have been universal in so far as the area of observation and information of the narrator extended. The story is evidently told in the form of a narrative derived from eye-witnesses, and this form, as I have elsewhere observed, seems to have been chosen or retained purposely to avoid any question of universality of the first and second kinds referred to above. The same form of narrative is preserved in the Chaldean legend. This fact is not affected by the doctrine held by some of the schools of disintegrators, that the narrative is divisible into two documents, respectively "Jahvisitic" and "Elohistic." I have elsewhere† shown that there is a very different reason for the use of these two names of God. But if there were two original witnesses whose statements were put together by an editor, this surely does not invalidate their testimony or deprive them of the right to have it understood as they intended.

It is thus evident that the whole question of "universality" is little more than a mere useless logomachy, having no direct relation to the facts or to the credibility of the narrative.

It is well, however, here to note that this useless strife about a word is no unfair example of the method of the so-called higher criticism in its treatment of the Bible. I could quote many instances from the writings of men of some repute both in Germany and in England. Such trifling requires merely to be explained to render it ridiculous; but when we find that it can mislead such men as Huxley and some of the divines whom he criticises, we need not wonder that it is accepted as sound learning by the crowd of mere *littèrateurs* and general readers.

There are also in connection with this question of universality certain scientific and historical facts which should be clearly stated in any discussion of the subject. Nothing is more certainly known in geology than that at the close of the later Tertiary or Pleistocene age the continents of the Northern Hemisphere stood higher and spread their borders more widely than at present. In this period also they were tenanted by a very grand and varied mammalian fauna, and it is in this continental age of the later Pleistocene or early modern time that we find the first unequivocal evidence of man as existing on various parts of the continents. At the close of this period occurred changes, whether sudden or gradual we do not know, though they could not have occupied a very long time, which led to the extinction of the earliest races of men and many contemporaneous animals. That these changes were in part, at least, of the nature of submergence we know from the fact that our present continents are more sunken or less elevated out of the water, and also from the deposit of superficial gravels and other detritus more recent than the Pleistocene over their surfaces. The human period of geology is thus separated into two portions by a submergence which must have been fearfully destructive of human and animal life, and vastly more extensive than that portion of the Noachian deluge which came under the observation of the author or authors of the narrative in Genesis. If, therefore, we suppose that existing men are the descendants of survivors of this event, there can be no reason to doubt that a catastrophe so terrible might remain in remembrance, and might be the same with the historical deluge recorded in the traditions and early history of so many races of men. Further, since large tracts of land in the Mediterranean, in the Persian Gulf and its vicinity, and on the coasts of Western Europe, which are known to have been above water in the antediluvian period are still submerged, it is possible that as yet we know nothing of the arts or literature of the greater and more civilized peoples of the antediluvian world except from historical records. If we could ascertain all the facts of this kind, it is possible that fewer difficulties would attend our speculations as to the origin and extent of civilization both before and after the deluge. At one time, indeed, it was supposed that the geological deluge was a much more ancient event than that of Noah, but recent discoveries have tended greatly to strengthen the probability of their identity as to date. Thus geology and archæology have no alternative but to believe in a deluge of wider range geographically than we could have inferred with any certainty from the narrative in Genesis. Why Dr. Huxley should have omitted to refer to these facts, so well known to all workers in Pleistocene geology, I cannot conjecture, unless he still thinks, with a few over-cautious savants, that it is dangerous to connect these ascertained facts of science with such despised mythical stories as those in the Bible and in the Chaldean Genesis.

---

* Gen. vii. 23.

† "Modern Science in Bible Lands," chap. iv.

One other objection to the deluge narrative perhaps deserves a word of comment—that urged against the statement of the gradual disappearance of the waters. The extraordinary difficulty is raised respecting this, that the water must have rushed seaward in a furious torrent. The objection is based apparently on the idea that the foundation for the original narrative was a river inundation in the Mesopotamian plain. This cannot be admitted ; but if it were, the objection would not apply. River inundations, whether of the Nile or Euphrates, subside inch by inch, not after the manner of mountain torrents. Thus this objection is another instance of difficulties gratuitously imported into the history.

In point of fact the narrator represents the deluge as prevailing for a whole year, which would be impossible in the case of a river inundation. He attributes it in part, at least, to the "great deep"—that is, the ocean ; and he represents the ark as drifting inland or toward the north. Such conditions can be satisfied only by the supposition of a subsidence of the land, similar, in kind, at least, to the great post-glacial flood of geology. Partial subsidences of this kind, local but very extreme, have occurred even in later times, as, for instance, in the Runn of Cutch, the delta of the Mississippi, and the delta of the Nile ; and if the objectors are determined to make the deluge of Noah very local and more recent than the post-glacial flood, it would be more rational to refer to subsidences like those just mentioned, and of which they will find examples in Lyell's "Principles" and other geological books. It is, however, decidedly more probable that Noah's flood is identical with that which destroyed the men of the mammoth age, the palæocosmic or "palæolithic" men ;* and in that case the recession of the waters would probably be gradual, but intermittent, "going and returning," as our ancient narrator has it ; but there need not have been any violent debacle.

After the above explanations, what can we say of the assertion that these objections are based on "assured physical knowledge" and "well-ascertained facts in the departments of literature and history," and that by this combined evidence the story of the deluge is shown to be "utterly devoid of historical truth." If the old Hebrew prophet and lawgiver could rise from that unknown grave which is the type of his modesty and heroic self-abnegation, he might surely be permitted to plead that in giving, to the best of his knowledge, the testimony which he had received, he has been guilty of no such baseless assertions either as to nature or history as those of which his modern detractors may be justly convicted.

Other objections, incidentally introduced in connection with the deluge, are derived from the longevity of the antediluvians, their alleged advances in the arts of life, the shortness of the ordinary chronology. These have, however, been effectually threshed out long ago in works sufficiently accessible. But I am tempted to notice, before closing, the reference twice made to the origin of woman, as related in Genesis, more especially as it is adduced in disparagement of that remarkable utterance of Jesus † respecting the marriage relation, which makes the woman the true head of the household, and asserts her rights in a manner which even modern civilization has not fully recognized. I have dealt with this objection in a previous work‡ in discussing Haeckel's monistic doctrines ; and perhaps the best method of treatment here will be to challenge the objector to improve on the simple statement in Genesis. As an evolutionist he should be able to account, without any divine intervention, for the origin of man and of the sexes, with their existing and past relations. He should be able to inform us, not as a mere hypothesis or speculation, but as a matter of fact and of legitimate induction therefrom, how, when, and where, and under what circumstances, and with what precautions against intermixture with unimproved simian relatives man and woman originated, and how their conjugal relations and those to their offspring were fixed, either before or after they acquired the gifts of reason and speech. We are told that the biblical account of this matter contradicts scientific facts and is even "monstrously improbable," and that the "origin of man among living things" is "a problem which lies strictly within the province of physical science." Now the world has been favored with a great number of ingenious speculations as to the origin of man and the origin of marriage and other social relations, which speculations are all more or less out of harmony with the Bible and with historical and natural facts, but are lamentably deficient in the matter of adequate proof. It would, if we are to abandon the Mosaic theory, be very refreshing and instructive once for all to have the actual and irrefragable evidence of indisputable scientific fact.

---

* "Modern Science in Bible Lands," chaps. iii. and iv.
† Matt. xix. 5.
‡ "Modern Ideas of Evolution," 1890, p. 147.

I have in this paper confined myself to comments on the matters in hand, and have treated these from the point of view merely of a student of nature interested in the moral and religious advancement of humanity, and in the validity of that revelation on which our higher beliefs and hopes for this world and the next must at present rest. This is, of course, only a partial and imperfect method of treating an inspired record claiming divine authority, and preferring to enlighten man as to his highest interests. Still, as the Word of the Lord goes on in its high mission from age to age, it is well now and then to remove from it the accretions which have masked its form; just as one desires to remove mud hovels or desert sand gathered around some noble Egyptian temple, that men may be able once more to behold it in its pristine beauty. But the figure applies only in part. The Egyptian temple, belongs to a religion which, however attractive in its time, has passed away. Jesus alone has the right to say, "Heaven and earth shall pass away; but My words shall not pass away." *

The above comments, slight though they must necessarily be, may serve to point out the weakness of some of the so-called scientific and critical objections to the biblical history, and that these largely represent that kind of ignorance characterized by our Lord as "not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God." Such questions require for their solution more of earnest faith in the Bible and serious study of its contents as the Word of God, and more of painstaking investigation of phenomena, whether sensuous or spiritual, considered as manifestations of God's power. They are not to be settled by conflicts between "ecclesiasticism" and agnostic science, and wise men will not allow these seriously to interfere with their beliefs.

The *ecclesia* of the New Testament, the assembly of the faithful, should represent purely the life and teaching of Jesus and His apostles; but "ecclesiasticism" may refer to something quite different. It may be either a shallow and feeble compromise between the truth of God and any system of philosophy or speculation which may at the time be dominant, or, on the other hand, it may represent mere sacerdotal pretension, or another system of compromises in which Christianity is made to return to the beggarly elements of ritualism and formalism discarded at its birth, or to the superstitions of later times. These things are sometimes laid to the charge of the Bible, as the outcome of its teaching. They are rather the products of its putrefaction and decay, or perhaps have the same relation to Christianity that a dry-rot fungus has to the tree in which it grows, or the rust-fungus to the ripening grain.

On the other side, physical science, which should consist of rational and arranged knowledge of natural phenomena, is often represented by a dry materialism which refuses to recognize the moral and spiritual as elements in nature, or even by speculations and foregone conclusions as far remote from natural truth as "ecclesiasticism" may be from that of the Bible, and for which we might fairly coin a companion word—"pseudognosticism." *

So long as the battle rages between these two antagonists of ecclesiasticism and pseudognosticism, neither the Bible nor Christianity is very directly interested, except that if one giant should slay the other, the whole force of the survivor might be thrown against them. Of this, however, there is no immediate prospect, and quiet workers must be content to endure the noise, the dust, and occasional random blows till a better time comes. It is a hopeful sign that so much is being done in the mean time for the circulation and exposition of the Bible and for the vindication of its truth by archæological discovery, for the spread of Christianity and civilization by missionary effort, and for the enlightenment of all men in things spiritual and natural. Let us hope that these quiet forces may prevail, and that after the present combatants have exhausted themselves in mutual conflicts, the meek may "inherit the earth." When the predictions of the New Testament are fulfilled this will assuredly take place, though not till after a contest in which many things now dominant will be overthrown.

---

* Mark xiii. 31.

* ψευδωνύμος γνώσις of Paul, in First Epistle to Timothy, vi. 20.

MONTREAL, September, 1890.

CARDINAL NEWMAN AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

BY WILFRID MEYNELL.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), September, 1890.

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, the eldest of a family of six children, was born within sound of Bow Bells [Feb. 21, 1801; d. Aug. 11, 1890], and he had his own experience of the "Turn Again Whittington" legend. For him, as well as for my Lord Mayor, certain phrases chimed, and they directed his steps. The child's "*Tolle, lege—tolle, lege,*" converted St. Augustine; and St. Augustine's "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*" converted Cardinal Newman. Face to face with the parallel between the Donatists and the Anglicans drawn by Cardinal Wiseman in the *Dublin Review,* Newman was left unmoved until he caught the words. "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum,* kept ringing in my ears. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum!* By those great words of the ancient Father, interpreting and summing up the long and varied course of ecclesiastical history, the theory of the *Via Media* was absolutely pulverised." From the head-centre of worldliness—the city of London, and from its innermost shrines of mammon and money—the banking houses, may be said to have issued forth those two captains of war upon the world—the great contemporary English Cardinals. Cardinal Manning's father was connected with the Bank of England, Cardinal Newman's was a partner with the Ramsbottoms in Lombard Street; the relative positions of the two banks, one official and the other a private venture, being afterwards reproduced in the ecclesiastical careers of the two boys born within a decade of years of one another, and friends, counterparts, and contrasts during sixty years.

Newman's father, whose family were small landed proprietors in Cambridgeshire, was a man of cultivation, equally enthusiastic as a musician and as a Freemason. He married Miss Jemima Fourdrinier; and it is a little curious to remember that Newman, by his mother, was, like Faber by his father, a direct descendant of Huguenot refugees. The Fourdriniers were papermakers, who had introduced improvements into the process of manufacture, and the name is still to be seen on a plate by the wayfarer on Ludgate Hill. The bank failing, Mr. Newman took a brewery at Alton, working at it with a perseverance that did not command success. The mother's jointure was all that finally remained to the family, and even this was diminished by Goschen-like feats in national finance. It was said that John Henry Newman was to go to the Bar, had things flourished; just as young Manning seemed settling at the Colonial Office when the fortunes of his father, too, fell or fluctuated. The Established Church offered to both a readier livelihood, and though it is suggested that Cardinal Manning and Mr. Gladstone might have changed places with advantage to both, no one, probably, has ever seriously believed that the one Cardinal, any more than the other, was without a clamorous vocation for an ecclesiastical career. Assuredly never did temporalities, or the need of them, so work for spirituality as in this story of the ways and means of families—a story which, in Newman's case at least, is not mere rumour and afterthought. It became one of John Henry's pleasures to be able to give his father, at a time of care and embarrassment, the good news of his election to a Fellowship at Oriel. This was in 1823, and the father died not long after, to be followed very suddenly, about 1828, by a daughter Mary. The family drifted from place to place—to Brighton; to Strand-on-the-Green; in 1829 to a cottage at Horspath, which they exchanged for a cottage in Nuncham Courtney, offered to Newman by Dornford, a Fellow of Oriel. "In the Midlands," says Thomas Mozley, "it would have been set down as the habitation of a family of weavers or stockingers." But it had its associations. Jean Jacques Rousseau had lived in it; and Nuncham was supposed to be Goldsmith's "deserted village." It was there that a group of the family was drawn by Miss Maria Giberne, a lady who much admired Newman in those days and who did him service afterwards in Italy, hunting up as witnesses the unfortunate women whose testimony was so fatal to

Dr. Achilli's character, though it failed to win the verdict of the court. That group, which has the affectations of the time, added to the drawing and composition of a lady amateur also of the time, was described by the Cardinal, in a letter he wrote to me late in his life, as "a libel on my mother and her children"; but it was differently regarded by other members of the circle. From Nuneham, Mrs. Newman and her daughters went to Iffley; whence they took in hand the school and the poor at Littlemore, a hamlet, attached to the pastorate of St. Mary's, at which Newman built, out of his own resources, first a church and then his monastic home. But just before the church was consecrated, and long before the monastery was begun, Rosebank Cottage was emptied of its folk. The spring of the year 1836 saw the marriage of Mr. John Mozley with Miss Jemima Newman, the Cardinal's second sister; and a few days afterwards Mrs. Newman fell ill, to die in a fortnight. As John Henry, who loved her tenderly, said:

> "One moment here, the next she trod
> The viewless mansion of her God."

A few months later, in September 1836, Miss Harriett Newman, the elder sister, was married to the Rev. Thomas Mozley. Four years before these marriages, a brother of the two husbands—the Rev. James Mozley—had written home to his sister: "Newman is going to introduce me to his mother and sisters. The Miss Newmans are very learned persons, deeply read in ecclesiastical history and in all the old divines, both High Church and Puritanical. But, notwithstanding this, they are, I believe, very agreeable and unaffected." By the marriage of Thomas Mozley, Newman secured not only a brother-in-law but also a Boswell. He had been Mozley's tutor at Oriel, and he was also his hero. Mozley's services to Tractarianism are as many as his thousands of articles in the *Times* on matters pertaining to religion in England. And as each contemporary and friend fell out of the ranks, there was a tribute to him least expected in the place where it appeared—the obituary column of the paper to read which is, says Mr. Ruskin, moral deterioration. His two volumes of "Reminiscences of the Oxford Movement" are a record, unequalled in vitality and vivacity, of a group of men devoted to God and to each other, as have been few men so incongruously brought together. That Cardinal Newman did not wholly appreciate Mozley's labours—which bore to outsiders the aspect of being those of love as well as of authorship—is one of the freaks of fate which brothers-in-law are called upon to endure. The truth is that Cardinal Newman, once the "Apologia" was written, desired that the story he had told should stand, no man daring to add to it anything or to take anything away.

Next in fame to John Henry comes Francis William, about four years his junior. Frank followed his brother to Dr. Nicholas's school at Ealing, each going at a bound to the top. When the elder went to Trinity College, Oxford, Frank, too young for college, followed to Oxford, and, says Mozley in chosen terms, "pursued his studies, as far as was compatible with an amiable but universal and persistent antagonism, under John Henry Newman's directions, in lodgings." In other substantial ways, John Henry was able to be of use to this brilliant younger brother, who, in due course, gained easily one of the best double-firsts ever known. When Francis came of age, the future Cardinal addressed to him a set of rhymes, of which these are some:

> "Dear Frank, we both are summoned now
> As champions of the Lord;
> Enrolled am I, and shortly thou
> Must buckle on the sword;
> A high employ, nor lightly given,
> To serve as messengers of Heaven."

But Frank Newman had already—in this year 1826—other thoughts. Two years of Oxford life had seen his fervent Evangelicalism evaporate. He was full of difficulties, and he did not seek a solution of them at the hands of his elder brother, to confer with whom even the Queen of Sheba was setting forth from the ends of the earth. It may be noted, in illustration of the old truth as to the households of prophets, that not one of Cardinal Newman's immediate family followed him to Rome, "though he drew the stars after him"; that Father Faber's army of converts included none of his near relatives; and that Cardinal Manning may regard it as the most wonderful of his many wonderful successes, that one of his brothers, the late amiable and refined Mr. Charles Manning, trod in his steps. In his "Phases of Faith," Mr. Frank Newman gives dim reasons for being beyond his brother's influence:

> "One person there was at Oxford who might have seemed my natural adviser—I mean my elder brother, the Rev. John Henry Newman. As a warm-hearted and generous brother who exercised towards me paternal care I esteemed him, and felt a deep gratitude: as a man of various culture and peculiar genius I admired and was proud of him; but my doctrinal religion impeded my loving him as much as he deserved, and even justified my

> feeling some distrust of him. He never shared my strong attraction towards those whom I regarded as spiritual persons; on the contrary, I thought him stiff and cold towards them. Moreover, soon after his ordination he had startled and distressed me by adopting the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, and in rapid succession worked out views which I regarded as full-blown 'Popery.' I speak of the years 1823–6. It is strange to think that twenty years more had to pass before he learnt the place to which his doctrines belonged."

When John Henry Newman arrived at his mother's cottage after his eventful tour in Southern Europe, in 1833, Frank had just returned from Persia. Before the end of that year the two brothers were not on speaking terms. The estrangement is told in the "Apologia": "I would have no dealings with my brother, and I put my conduct upon a syllogism. I said, 'St. Paul bids us to avoid those who cause divisions; you cause divisions; therefore I avoid you.'" That mood did not last long; and though the difference of belief became more emphatic with the passage of time, and Professor Francis Newman did not, with years, acquire a less positive utterance, there were many meetings of tolerance and of fraternal affection, even down to the last years of the Cardinal's life, when his brother came from Weston-super-Mare to be with him at his holiday retreat at Rednal, now his resting-place forever.

"There was also another brother, not without his share in the heritage of natural gifts." This is all that even Thomas Mozley has to say of Charles Robert Newman, alive at the time the "Reminiscences" were written. His death subsequently, and now the death of Cardinal Newman, make it possible to give him a fuller mention. "But has not every house its trial?" asks Charlotte Brontë, by strange way of comfort that misfortunes are for many, not for one. The Newmans had their household trial in the wayward brother whose eccentricities took a form peculiarly unwelcome to those nearest to him in blood. At the time of his death, in 1884, a clergyman contributed to a newspaper some rather wild hearsay about the conduct of Charles Newman when he was acting as master in a school at Hurstmonceaux. This clergyman had been curate at Hurstmonceaux to Julius Hare, who had known Charles Newman there a few years before. According to him:

> "To Hare he lamented the narrow-mindedness of his brothers, John and Francis, who had entirely cast him off and left him to fight his way in the world unaided because of his professed infidelity. At the time I am speaking of, somewhere between 1834 and 1844, Newman was miserably poor, entirely dependent on his small pittance as an usher in a third-rate country school. The task of teaching rude Sussex lads was, as might be imagined, tolerably irksome to a man of Newman's high intellectual power. The relations between him and his principal soon became strained; and the engagement was suddenly terminated by a tussle between the usher and his class. . . . Hare, I remember, used to make excuses for Newman's religious and moral obliquities on the ground of partial insanity—'there was a screw loose somewhere.'"

This writer does not appear to have even seen the ne'er-do-well to whom his sympathies went out so cheaply—but, as commonly happens in such matters—at the heavy expense of the surviving relatives. They treated the insinuations with silence—all that was possible to them. As one of them expressed it to me in a letter at the time (April 1884), which I may now venture to quote:

> "I suppose Precentor V—— is a clergyman and has the feelings of a just and gentle man. I therefore marvel that he should think it right to drag before the public events of forty or fifty years back concerning an obscure person lately carried to the grave—matters not creditable if true, and not refutable if false or falsely coloured; and should couple with them statements against me and my brother which we cannot duly repel and dispel except by attacking our brother just deceased. No man has a right to impose on us this odious task."

Very briefly may be stated the main facts, but only those which his surviving brothers were convinced that Mr. Charles Newman himself would not call in question. When not far out of his teens, Charles Newman wrote to some cousins renouncing his family, and begging that they would not consider him to be a Newman, his only reason for the renunciation being that the family were too religious. His mother was still alive, and she and his sisters tried to win him, but without success, from the life of loneliness and isolation he elected to lead. Never was a kindness denied him, however one-sided the arrangement might be. Both his brothers, after they had been "cast off" by him, not he by them, managed to put together funds for sending him to take a degree at Bonn University, at his earnest desire. But he came away without even offering himself for examination, a step he explained by saying that the judges would not grant him a degree because of the offence he had given by his treatment of faith and morals in an essay which they called *teterrima*. This was only one of a series of aids given to Charles by John Henry and by Francis, who, unlike in so much, resembled each other in their generous desires and actions towards their mother's youngest son. But in him they found, as one of them expresses it in a private letter, only "the closest representation of an ancient cynic philosopher this nineteenth century can afford."

A man is entered in a Biographical Dictionary by the date of his birth; but it is really the date of death that ranges him in the memories of mankind. Macaulay and Newman belong to a different epoch, but were born within a month or two of each other. Newman was a baby when Keats, a child of four or five, who had not yet heard of Lemprière, was standing with a drawn sword at the door of his mother's bedroom to shield her from disturbance during an illness. Shelley, just over eight, was already exciting the admiration of his sisters by his declamation of Latin verse. Byron was beginning his troublesome teens, scribbling his first verses, and being well hated at Harrow. Newman hardly ranks as the contemporary of these, though he was twenty when Keats died, was of age when Shelley died, and when Byron died was twenty-three. With Coleridge, Southey and Wordsworth, though these were all born between thirty and thirty-five years before him, he lived in the world for thirty-three, forty-two, and forty-nine years. In 1836, Faber, returning to Oxford from the Long, which he had spent at the Lakes, reported that "Wordsworth spoke of Newman's sermons, some of which he had read and liked exceedingly." Walter Scott was thirty when Newman was born, and when Scott died Newman was beginning the Tractarian movement which was to give Abbotsford to Rome.

Newman's literary admirations were in great part those of the period. For Scott he had all Mr. Gladstone's enthusiasm. The tinsel of that mediævalism did not disconcert him; and he gratefully mentions Scott as having in some sort, by his scenes of chivalry, prepared the path for the Catholic revival; surely a route to the Oratory by way of Wardour Street. Scott's novels he put into the hands of the boys at the Oratory school at Edgbaston as prizes, and even examined in them. Perhaps he had his happiest holiday when he spent five weeks at Abbotsford at the end of 1852, the guest of Mr. Hope-Scott, who, like his wife, Lockhart's daughter, had become a Catholic. When Newman got the invitation he wrote in reply: "It would be a great pleasure to spend some time with you, and then I have ever had the extremest sympathy for Walter Scott, and it would delight me to see his place. When he was dying, I was saying prayers (whatever they were worth) for him continually, thinking of Keble's words, 'Think on the minstrel as ye kneel.'" Lockhart was still alive, and the visits his daughter and son-in law paid him in London, he repaid at Abbotsford, whither, finally, he had his books taken. There, in the breakfast-room, because he could not leave the ground-floor, and because he shunned the dining-room where Sir Walter gave up the ghost, the old editor, a stoic amid suffering, a Protestant among Catholics, passed away, with Father Lockhart, a distant cousin, at his unresponsive side, and the sound of his daughter's voice, reading prayers from her "Garden of the Soul," in his ears.

One can well imagine the mystification of the old editor of the *Quarterly* in presence of the Popery which sat at his hearth, although he had been willing to give Tractarianism a distant hearing in his Review. In 1837, one of the party at Oxford complacently records that "Lockhart finds he must have an infusion of Oxford principles; it takes with people now—that is, such people as read the *Quarterly*"; and Philip Pusey, the member of Parliament, told his brother Edward that one of Newman's greatest triumphs was his "getting hold of the *Quarterly*." A little later this complacency must have been shaken by the report that Murray had said he would have given a thousand pounds to be able to suppress the article referred to. Though the *Quarterly* might have turned half an ear timidly toward the preacher of St. Mary the Virgin, such leniency could not be expected from the rival Review. Of course Macaulay was cock-sure, even *before* reading one of Newman's Anglican books, that he could reply to it. Writing to the editor of the *Edinburgh*, Napier, in February 1843, he says: "I hear much of a defence of the miracles of the third and fourth centuries by Newman. I have not yet read it. I think that I could treat that subject without giving any scandal to any rational person; and I should like it much. The times require a Middleton." There was no weak openness to conviction lurking behind those words; nor yet behind these, written eight months later, also to Napier, and also before he had read the book he was eager to smash: "Newman announces an English hagiology in numbers, which is to contain the Lives of such blessed Saints as Thomas à Becket and Dunstan. I should not dislike to be the devil's advocate on such an occasion." In his essay on the "Comic Dramatists of the Restoration," Macaulay just alludes to the Tractarians, saying that Jeremy Collier's notions touching "the importance of vestments, ceremonies, and solemn days, differed little from those which are now held by Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman"—a sentence which suggests to the initiated that the writer wrote once more without having read Newman—who was never a Ritualist, and treasured no husk except it held a kernel.

After all, it was left to Sir James Stephen and to Henry Rogers to pillory Popery in the pages of the *Edinburgh.* The first of these, after confessing in a letter to Napier, in 1841, that whatever comes he "cannot but cherish the good old Protestant feelings of our ancestors," thus conveniently explains away Mr. Newman: "As for Newman himself, I am sorry that his integrity should be impugned. I am convinced that a more upright man does not exist. But his understanding is essentially illogical and inveterately imaginative; and I have reason to fear that he labours under a degree of cerebral excitement, which unfits him for the mastery of his own thoughts and the guidance of his own pen." It is worth noting, that while Newman was being thus described on hearsay as a literary lunatic, Pusey, his constant companion, was writing of him to a friend: "You will be glad to hear that the immediate excitement about Tract 90 is subsiding. It has been a harassing time for N., but he was wonderfully calm."

Macaulay, instead of reading the books he had already prejudged, probably contented himself with reading the *Edinburgh* attack on them (April 1843), and not all of that. "I have read three or four pages of the article on the Puseyites, which I like very much. I should be glad to know who wrote it." The writer was Henry Rogers, who congratulated himself with the true Whig confidence, when he sent his MS. to the editor, that he had "not spared ridicule" in treating "publications which are having a large sale, and are doing immense mischief amongst the young, the ardent, and the sentimental." But "the young, the ardent, and the sentimental" had grown into men and reviewers by the time the "Apologia" appeared; and Newman, for the first time, found himself seriously considered, whether favourably or not, by secular publications.

Indeed, "the young, the ardent, and the sentimental" of the early forties had made themselves felt in the other walks of life, as well as in literature, before many years were over. They manned the Anglican Church. Rival Prime Ministers, if they fought all the week, sat under the same Tractarian shepherd in Mayfair. A Lord Chief Justice ranked it as his highest honour to be the host of Cardinal Newman, even after his secession; and there was no house in London where he was more welcome than at the Deanery of St. Paul's. Dean Church was one of that immense body of actual contemporaries or immediate juniors who came under Newman's personal influence, and who, in their turn, spread the principles which have transformed the Anglican Communion. In one sense—Catholics do not hesitate to admit it—the *Guardian* expresses the bare truth when it speaks of Newman as "the founder of the Anglican Church as it now is," and says: "Great as his services have been to the Communion in which he died, they are as nothing by the side of those he rendered to the Communion in which the most eventful years of his life were spent. He will be mourned by many in the Roman Church; but their sorrow will be less than ours, because they have not the same paramount reason to be grateful to him." Not in admiration for his mind, nor in reverence for his character, nor in personal devotion yielded him even by strangers, can we to whom he came be outstripped by those whom he left. His life was divided with a strange equality of time between the two Communions; for he lived in each for half of it almost to a month. But he actually changed the face of the Anglican Church, while he could not alter one feature of the other. It was he who taught the Anglican Church; but to the Roman Church he came only to learn.

Of all his contemporaries, the Anglican clergy bear most the marks of him. What their predecessors were seventy years ago, when Newman began "to come out of his shell," has ceased to be a memory, but remains as a tradition. "Decent, easy men, who supremely enjoyed the gifts of the founder, from the toil of reading, thinking, or writing they had absolved their conscience. Their conversation stagnated in a round of college business, Tory politics, personal anecdotes, and private scandal. Their dull and deep potations excused the intemperance of youth." Such were the Oxford dons of an earlier generation, as described by Gibbon, Newman's greatest master in style, and his finger-post to the Fathers. "Whenever you meet a clergyman of my time," said Sydney Smith to Mr. Gladstone about the year 1835, "you may be sure he is a bad clergyman;" and Sydney

Smith had as little love as Gibbon himself would have had for "Puseyism."

Vainly was Evangelicalism pitched against "two-bottle orthodoxy." In Wesley, Newman as a Catholic recognised "the shadow of a Catholic saint"; but the name of Wesley worked no wonders in the Oxford of Newman's early days. The Evangelicals entrenched themselves in an obscure college, and their influence never spread beyond St. Edmund's Hall. Mozley says it may have been a common peculiarity of their complexions, but the St. Edmund's men never looked clean. He adds that their mental and moral claims to influence were inconspicuous; and Archbishop Tait of Canterbury admits that there is too much truth in this ugly delineation. Newman and his friends, on the other hand, joined learning with sanctity, and united good-breeding with unworldliness. "We loved the Evangelicals because they loved our Lord," said Pusey—a formula which sums up the Catholic attitude towards the Salvation Army to-day; but that is the beginning and the end of the bond; and Newman saw, even if Keble did not, that liberalism in religion, represented by Whately and the rest, was a force Evangelicalism could not touch: that Evangelicalism was itself only another form of liberalism, though the feelings and prejudices of its adherents were on the side of personal religiousness. The men who had a general idea of the importance of dogma, but who had not the enthusiasm of religion, and the men who had the enthusiasm but no science or coherence, met together under Newman, and supplied to each other the deficiency of each. The leaders themselves—Newman, Pusey, and Keble—united tender personal piety with a zeal for dogmatic exactitude—for truth in thought as well as in conduct. The reasons why the early leadership seemed to lie with Pusey, and not with Newman, are well known. Equally well known is it that Newman was the mainspring of the movement. "Out of my own head," he says he started the Tracts, and the Tracts became the text-books of the new Anglicanism. The doctrines they expounded, though fresh to the hearers, were old as the Apostles, and were gathered by Newman from the Bible he loved and studied; they had been taught without intermission by the Catholic Church from the first Peter to the last Pius; and the Anglican Church itself, under Archbishop Laud, fitfully received them. The result of Newman's labour as a revivalist is seen to-day in half the rectories of England. The typical Anglican minister trains, conducts, even dresses himself on the model of the Catholic priest; and if externals could make him the real thing, the real thing he would perfectly be. Beautiful were the tributes which Newman's death elicited from the conspicuous pulpits of Anglicanism, and most affecting to Catholics; but some of the preachers strangely misunderstood their man when they hinted, as Canon Knox-Little did, that Newman would never have left Anglicanism in 1845 had he foreseen how many Roman collars would be worn, how many beards be shaved off, how many "celebrations" be talked about, and confessions heard, in the Establishment in 1890. Why, the Arians in their day had Bishops, and Masses, and organisation as perfect as that of the orthodox; but it was with Athanasius that Newman ranged himself while still an Anglican; and it was precisely the parallel he found between Anglicans and Arians or Donatists that brought him at last from Oxford to Birmingham. It was, in truth, to the Canon Knox-Littles that he addressed himself when he said:

> "Look into the matter more steadily; it is very pleasant to decorate your chapels, oratories, and studies now, but you cannot be doing this for ever. It is pleasant to adopt a habit or a vestment; to use your Office-book or your beads; but it is like feeding on flowers unless you have that objective vision in your faith, and that satisfaction in your reason, of which devotional exercises and ecclesiastical appointments are the suitable expression. They will not last in the long run, unless commanded and rewarded on Divine authority; they cannot be made to rest on the influence of individuals. It is well to have rich architecture, curious works of art, and splendid vestments, when you have a present God; but oh! what a mockery if you have not. If your externals surpass what is within, you are so far as hollow as your Evangelical opponents, who baptise, yet expect no grace. Thus your Church becomes not a home, but a sepulchre; like those high cathedrals once Catholic, which you do not know what to do with, which you shut up, and make monuments of, sacred to the memory of what has passed away."

Another paragraph in acknowledgment of the homage from Anglican pulpits, and I have done with dreary polemics. Those preachers who praised Newman so generously, praised a man who was, according to their official creed, a blasphemer—one who had deliberately chosen, in mature life, to practise the "blasphemous fable" of the Mass, though born in the enlightened Establishment. Is it too much to suppose that Newman's death and the sequent utterances of so many and so illustrious subscribers to the Thirty-nine Articles, may somewhat hasten the time when the hard words of that official creed shall be mitigated? If not, one can only say that the manifestation of sympathy over Newman's tomb was the greatest exhibition of what he most dreaded—the "liberalism in religion" which thinks one creed as good as another, which owns the Church's rule for the body, but discards it for the mind.

"You are under a destiny," Newman said very solemnly to the Anglican clergy, after he had become a Catholic; and he was attributing to them what he had always believed in a very special manner of himself. Not the third Napoleon himself had franker conviction of the distinctness of his fate. During the tour in the South of Europe with Hurrell Froude, in 1833—the tour which produced "Lead, kindly Light"—"I began," he tells us, "to think that I had a mission." When he paused in Rome and was asked by Monsignor Wiseman to pay a second visit, he replied with great gravity, "I have a work to do in England." In Sicily, after an illness, he sat down on his bed and began to sob violently. "My servant asked what ailed me. I could only answer him, I have a work to do in England." The record, with the obvious hint, is made by himself; and he evidently believed it to be no mere coincidence that his return home, with its strange adventures of both delay and speed, timed with Keble's sermon on "National Apostasy." It was the first Sunday after his arrival; and he says, "I have ever considered this day as the start of the religious movement of 1833." When he retired to Littlemore, as a sort of halfway house between England and Rome, he turned up an old copy-book, and it took his breath away to find on it a cross drawn between the words "verse" and "book." Moreover, a further device, in which one less smitten with his destiny might have recognized a sister's chain and pendant, he could not make out to be anything but "a set of beads with a little cross." Then there came his reception into the Catholic Church, and thus the man of destiny records it:

> "I am this night expecting Father Dominic the Passionist, who, from his youth, has been led to have distinct and direct thoughts, first, of the countries of the north, and then of England. After thirty years' (almost) waiting, he was, without his own act, sent here."

This is in the "Apologia"; and in "Loss and Gain," under fictitious names, the story is told in greater detail:—

> "On the Apennines, near Viterbo, there dwelt a shepherd boy, in the first years of this century, whose mind had early been drawn heavenward; and one day, as he prayed before an image of the Madonna, he felt a vivid intimation that he was to preach the Gospel under the northern sky. There appeared no means by which a Roman peasant should be turned into a missionary; nor did the prospect open, when this youth found himself, first, a lay brother, then a Father, in the Congregation of the Passion. Yet, though no external means appeared, the inward impression did not fade; on the contrary it became more definite; and, in process of time, instead of the dim north, England was engraven on his heart. And, strange to say, as years went on, without his seeking, for he was simply under obedience, our peasant found himself at length upon the very shore of the stormy Northern Sea, whence Cæsar of old looked out for a new world to conquer; yet that he should cross the Strait was still as little likely as before. But the day came, not, however, by any determination of his own, but by the same Providence which, thirty years before, had given him the intimation of it."

The importance which each Christian must of necessity attach to himself—he for whom the Heavens descended to the earth, who has angels for his ministers, who is an heir of Paradise, and who traces the special designs of Providence in the details of his daily life—might seem to be alien to the humility and to the self-abnegation which Christianity enjoins. Yet he, whose Christian egoism is most sublime, he it is who, paradoxically, abases and annihilates himself most completely. "From a boy I had been led to consider that my Maker and I, His creature, were the two beings, luminously such." And the attitude remained to the end, and determined the disposition of Newman towards all people and things. "It is face to face in all matters between man and his God. He alone creates; He alone has redeemed; before His awful eyes we go in death; and in the vision of Him is our eternal beatitude." But the persons who came near to the Sacred Person had reflections of His glory, and as such were held in worship by Newman—the angels and the saints. And the persons about himself he frankly regarded in the light of their relations, not with the outer world, but with him and his spiritual being. The record of his Oxford contemporaries is the record of what they were to him, "John Henry Newman"; he learnt habits of thought and the idea of the Church as a corporate body from Whately; Hurrell Froude "fixed deep in me the idea of devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and led me gradually to believe in the Real Presence"; Keble familiarized him with the sacramental system; and from Dr. Hawkins he learnt the value of tradition. The bond was a close one in all cases; but it had its basis on religion. In the streets of Dublin, long after, Whately as Archbishop, and Newman as Rector of the Catholic University, met without recognition; but the story of his having absented himself, years before, from chapel on purpose to avoid receiving the Sacrament with Dr. Whately, was pure invention. "He made himself dead to me," says Newman of Whately with great simplicity; adding, "My reason told me it was impossible we could have got on together longer had he stayed in Oxford; yet I loved him too much to bid him farewell without pain." When Kingsley said, "Truth for its own sake had never been a virtue with the Roman clergy," and this in a mere magazine with the poor life of a month in it, no one would have bothered his head over it—the charge was too hackneyed to need a new rebuff from Catholics. But "Father Newman" was linked with the passage, fortunately, as he himself afterwards thought. He accuses "me, John Henry Newman," exclaimed the hermit at Birmingham, whose destiny the Heavens had made known to him.

So the "Apologia" was written. Later on, the passages which seemed to have personal resentment were suppressed by the author; who, moreover, gave the Rev. Sir William Cope a most interesting explanation of his adoption of the world's own weapons—hard words—in the unequal duel: the world would not believe him if he spoke calmly. His after-thoughts were that Kingsley should escape resentment because he had become accidentally "the instrument in the good Providence of God, by whom I had an opportunity given me, which otherwise I should not have had, of vindicating my character and conduct in my 'Apologia.'" Not, as he might well have said, "vindicating the Catholic doctrine as to truth, and the sin of lying"; but vindicating, what with Newman was a synonym, "my character and conduct." And Newman adds, in the same letter, that a friend had chanced to hear Kingsley "preaching about me kindly"; and about Athanasius, too, he had been writing less unkindly; so "I said Mass for his soul as soon as I heard of his death." Never surely did any Evangelical, old or modern, of them all, see the finger of Heaven more filially than he who felt it every five minutes of his life, and who recognized even in Kingsley the instrument of the Lord—for His servant to play upon. The old friends he lost, and the new friends he made when he became a Catholic were they whom "*God* gave me when *He* took every one else away." "And in you, Ambrose St. John," that chief new friend, he says, "I gather up and bear in memory those familiar and affectionate companions and counsellors who in Oxford *were given to me* to be my daily solace and relief; and all those others, of great name and high example, who were my thorough friends; and also those many younger men, whether I knew them or not, who have never been disloyal to me by word or deed." To Pius IX. he paid his homage in a sermon at Birmingham, in which he recalls "his great act towards us here, towards me":

> "One of his first acts after he was Pope was, in his great condescension, to call me to Rome; then, when I got there, he bade me send for my friends to be with me; and he formed us into an Oratory. . . . . Such is the Pope now happily reigning in the Chair of St. Peter; such are our personal obligations to him; such has he been towards us, towards you, my brethren."

It was precisely this pervading personality in Newman that distinguished him from his contemporaries. The pretentious "we" was dropped in favour of the simpler "I." The abstract was exchanged for the concrete under a pen primed with individuality. The unit spoke to the unit—to the units who make up mankind. "Heart speaketh unto heart," was his own chosen motto as a Cardinal, who bared his heart for the inspection of friend and foe; who told men how, when he was ordained an Anglican minister, "he wept most abundant and most sweet tears at the thought of what he had then become," and so on, through all the phases of his life. Only those entirely ignorant of Newman's selflessness in conduct would put down this self-analysis and self-centred measurement of men to petty vanity, which he was wholly free from, or to vulgar love of applause, of which he had none. For the most part the poet alone has shown himself so spontaneously, so autobiographically in his manuscripts; and all the world has listened. But here, at last, humanity could be studied in a priest. The personal and the human had re-inhabited poetry with Shelley, Keats, and Wordsworth; and with Newman the personal and the human entered into theology, and into his account of it. He allowed himself to be put under the microscope, and how he bore the ordeal all his contemporaries will tell.

Yet Newman's friendships, though formed and governed under exacting and unusual conditions, were extraordinarily tender. This was one phase of his character which delighted George Eliot, who writes on this and other points to Miss Sara Hennell:

"I am reading with great amusement (!) J. H. Newman's 'Lectures on the Position of Catholics.' They are full of clever satire and description. . . . . It was just what I wanted to hear about you, that you were having some change, and I think the freshness of the companionship must help other good influences, not to mention the 'Apologia,' which breathed new life into me when I read it. Pray mark that beautiful passage in which he thanks his friend, Ambrose St. John. I know hardly anything that delights me more than such evidences of sweet brotherly love being a reality in the world. I envy you your opportunity of seeing and hearing Newman, and should like to make an expedition to Birmingham for that sole end."

If only she had gone! There, at the Oratory, are still three of the immortal band named with Father St. John: Father Neville, the devoted "William" of Newman's last whispers; Father Ryder, a man of fine literary temper; and Father Austin Mills.

These friendships among men were less common when the Oxford movement began than they have since become; and the present generation, if it owed nothing else to the *Newmania* (as Bishop Hampden called it), would have reason to be grateful for this infusion of tenderness into the relations of man with man. The sentiment expressed, to George Eliot's admiration, in the closing passage of the "Apologia," appears and reappears elsewhere; in Newman's method of addressing that best type of the modern Anglican, Dr. Church, Dean of St. Paul's—"*Carissime,*" in his sudden outbreak where, on hearing of the death of Hurrell Froude, he throws aside in one epithet the conventional stiffness of the eighteenth century which ruled nearly all his poems, and exclaims:

"*Dearest!* he longs to speak, as I to know,
  And yet we both refrain;
It were not good: a little doubt below,
  And all will soon be plain."

Newman's young men improved on their model. Faber, his "acolyte," who followed him to Rome within a month, and practically founded the London Oratory, had a greater exuberance of both feeling and expression. To the present Duke of Rutland, then Lord John Manners, he wrote:

"Thou walkest with a glory round thy brow,
Like saints in pictures, radiant in the blaze
And splendour of thy boyhood, mingling now
With the bold bearing of a man, that plays
In eyes, which do with such sweet skill express
Thy soul's hereditary gentleness."

That male eyes had "sweet skill," or that men had eyes at all worth observing by men, came as a surprise, if not as a shock, to many; and Faber himself, writing to some one who expostulated with him, says: "Strong expressions towards male friends are matters of taste. I feel what they express to me. B. thinks a revival of chivalry in male friendships a characteristic of the rising generation, and a hopeful one." "B.," whoever he was, was right. The shyness which made an Englishman ashamed to embrace even his father, arose from times when wine-parties and a common interest in the heredity of dogs and horses were the most sacred links between men. The Oxford movement established different relations—of mutual confidence, mutual affection, mutual respect. Of the influence for good which these generous friendships exercised, even Mark Pattison was sensible—even Mr. James Anthony Froude. At first, when undergraduates went home raving about Newman, anxious parents shook their heads. The correspondence passing about the same date between Lord Strangford and the old Duke of Rutland, reveals the perturbations of aristocratic fathers over the friendships between their sons and the plain commoner who was afterwards to make his Queen an Empress, his solicitor a baronet, and his secretary a peer. So of Newman, the fountain of so much piety for thirsty souls in future, anxious mothers were asking, as did the mother of the Mozleys: "But is he a *good* man"? And, "but is he a good man"? diffident fathers and confiding sisters chimed in. When the sermons and tracts penetrated into the provinces, the question answered itself; and happy were the mothers whose sons were under the influence which made religion seem to the young, and even to the ambitious, something manly and ennobling. Wordsworth read and admired them, but he drew the line at Newman's verse. Had the "Dream of Gerontius"—the composition in which Newman's sincerity of feeling clothes itself the most poetically—been then written, it might have extorted some reluctant recognition from the bard, whom one can imagine as rather bored by Frederick Faber's glowing eulogy of his friend and master, while the old man and the young walked together in the Lake country.

It was near Windermere, too, that Charlotte Brontë, as the guest of the Shuttleworths in 1850, met her future biographer, and told her during their first talk "about Father Newman's lectures at the Oratory in a very concise, graphic way." Then follow some dots, eloquent dots. What do they conceal? Probably some phrase not much more reasonable than Carlyle's description of Newman as possessing "the brain of a medium-sized rabbit." For Charlotte Brontë combined, as no mind, thanks largely to Newman, ever will again in England, exquisite sensibility, deep religiousness, and an open intelligence, with as vulgar a notion of Popery as that of any Exeter Hall rhetorician. "Good people—very good people—I doubt not, there are among the Romanists," she says in a weakly generous mood; "but," she makes haste to add, writing to Mrs. Gaskell, who had shown leanings to primitive Christianity, "but the system is not one which should have such sympathy as *yours*. Look at Popery taking off the mask at Naples." The last sentence reads like the text of one of Newman's lectures, a text to be torn mercilessly to tatters. By the way, Miss Brontë and Mrs. Gaskell went to tea at this time at Fox How, the house of the widow of Dr. Arnold; and Mrs. Arnold had yielded her eldest son, Thomas, to follow Newman to Rome. They were all in a tale, especially in homes of hereditary goodness. When, at the very beginning of things, Newman visited old Mr. Wilberforce, and saw his pious family, little did this pattern of Evangelicalism suppose that out of four sons three would become Catholics, leaving only Samuel to adorn the Anglican bench, while his unworldly brothers went their simple ways—one, Archdeacon Robert Isaac Wilberforce, to die while preparing for the priesthood in Rome; another, William, "the squire," to spend an obscure life as a humble Catholic layman; and the third, Henry—most delightful of them all—to found the *Weekly Register*, in this as in all else, says Newman, "actuated by an earnest desire to promote the interests of religion, though at the sacrifice of his own." What is recorded of the Scotts, the Arnolds, and the Wilberforces, is recorded of nearly every family in England. Lord Coleridge, who never showed a nobler figure than when he knelt by the coffin of the Cardinal in the dreary church at Birmingham, must have thought, amid so much Popery, of his own brother—a Jesuit priest; and Lord Selborne, lamenting Newman as the father of modern Anglicanism, also counts a brother among the band of Newman's closer followers to Rome.

Nor was this influence confined to those who came within the magic of Newman's personality, or to those who were students rather than hard-headed men of the world; or yet to men of his own generation. When a typical Yorkshireman, like Lord Ripon, with all the best qualities and sympathies which distinguish John Bull, appeared at the London Oratory to claim admission to the Catholic Church, it was to the writings of Newman that he attributed the transition which so greatly perturbed the mind of Mr. Gladstone. Yet even Mr. Gladstone, when he wrote bitterly of all others, said of Newman that, honored as he was, he illustrated the line that "the world knows nothing of its greatest men." Newman returned the compliment by speaking of Mr. Gladstone's as "so religious a mind." But Newman also accused Anglicans, in one of his lectures to them, of "praising this or that Catholic saint, to make up for abuse, and to show your impartiality." Whether Mr. Gladstone will plead guilty to this indictment I cannot say; but if he will look at his various and most welcome praises of Newman, and see how, by juxtaposition, they are made to imply dispraise of the brother and colleague who bears the burden of government and the responsibility of the bishopric, he will not wonder at the words of Newman coming to his reader's mind. Indeed, the throwing together of the names of the two Cardinals has been a common feat of jugglery vainly performed to annihilate the one or the other. It is delightful, despite all differences of temperament, and of the objectivity and the subjectivity with which each variously regarded the outer world, to see these two names linked together, if not in daily speech, in the unity of eternal love. When Newman was twenty-eight, the younger man of twenty was led captive by the "form and voice and penetrating words at Evensong in the University Church at Oxford"; where, having once seen and heard Newman, he "never willingly failed to be." When the fury of officialdom in the Anglican Church was fulminating against Littlemore, Manning, the born administrator, the bright hope of officialdom, wherever he was found, paid a conspicuous visit of sympathy to its occupant—though his thoughts just then were not the thoughts of Newman, especially as to Rome. This was what the Cardinal Archbishop was thinking of when he said at the Requiem at the London Oratory the other day: "And when trials came I was not absent from him. Littlemore is before me now as fresh as yesterday." The next time they met was in Rome, in 1848, when Newman was already an Oratorian, and then, four years later, the future Archbishop, having himself become a Catholic, listened once more to the "well-known voice, sweet as of old, but strong in the absolute truth, prophesying a second spring, in the first Provincial Council of Westminster." In 1857, Newman dedicated to Cardinal Manning his volume of "Sermons on Various Occasions," "as some memorial of the friendship there has been between us for nearly thirty years"; and in 1861 the compliment was returned, Cardinal Manning testifying: "To you I owe a debt of gratitude, for intellectual light and help, greater than to any one man of our time." There the matter may be left, under the hands that have never signed insincerities. What if, between two men of character so marked, there were light difficulties in the way of a continual and close interchange of thoughts and emotions? Only the vulgar can demand of men a contact contrary to temperament, or will profess to be astonished, when Cardinal Newman's biography comes to be published, if his most intimate and frequent letters are not found to be indited to his brother Cardinal; nor even to Father Faber, that "bright, particular star," who carried the London offshoot of the Birmingham Oratory to a pitch of prosperity outshining in external show its parent home.

When Pusey declared that "all the converts have deteriorated except Newman and Ward," he made his already sufficiently startling generalisation more startling still by linking together two names so dissimilar. Newman does not once mention Ward in the "Apologia," a conspicuous absence; but Ward's sayings and doings gave undoubted impetus to the movement which bore Mr. Newman to Rome. When Mr. Wilfrid Ward comes to write the second volume of the Life of his father, he will have to treat many a controversial episode between the two men; and the more open was the warfare then, the more delicate will be the handling of it now. "They have all come over to my side," said the old Cardinal with a smile, looking back on the controversies of the *Dublin Review*. Even before he received the Cardinalate he had become calm in the presence of Ward's criticism—with the calmness of a man who knows that the armour he wears cannot be penetrated, but that his own thrusts go straight home. Cardinal Newman's allusions to "the insolent and aggressive faction," in a private letter which got into print, were matched by phrases deliberately printed under his own hand. He knew "one Pope, but he recognised no other," least of all among the men who "stretched principles till they were close upon snapping." Even the *Tablet* refused to print letters from Ward. But he had the *Dublin Review* in his pocket; and his reply to Newman in its pages, in 1876, made Newman's friends indignant. Yet he himself was unmoved; as one who knew him intimately expressed it in a private letter to a sympathiser:

> "The Father is much touched by the cordial feeling shown by you and by many others in regard to the *Dublin* article. But he can't, for the life of him, see why you think so much of it—you, Allies, and so many others. He said he thought Ward had a perfect right to defend himself, and that he never had the least thought of complaining, or of in any way noticing the article; not from anything like contempt, but from indifference. Certainly he would deplore any opening of the case in the papers. The discussion would never end. No argument or remonstrance would avail with Veuillot or Ward. Besides the Father feels all the gravity of the charge he has brought, and thinks those who feel themselves aggrieved should have the chance of defending themselves. The case is fully stated: thoughtful men will sum up and give sentence in their own minds.

The ethical and other differences between Newman and Ward were of old standing; and Ward was impossible. But in one respect Ward was in greater sympathy with Newman than were some of his contemporaries. When "Tract 90" appeared, and when Mr. Lowe and others denounced it as shifty, Ward, with certain reservations, was the champion, in pamphlets and letters, of the special pleading of the most famous of the Tracts.

Can there be a doubt that Lord Beaconsfield was right, though the *Standard* of to-day pooh-poohs him, when he said, a generation later than 1845, that the Anglican Church still reeled under the secession of Dr. Newman? He was looking at it politically, and he pronounced it, with all the assurance of Downing Street, to be "a blunder." Lord John Russell probably combined private with public feeling when he alluded in Parliament, in 1851, to "a person of great eminence, of great learning, of great talents, whom we all have to deplore as having left the Protestant Church, and joined the Church of Rome—I mean, Mr. Newman." The busy world went on. It wondered a moment at the great renunciation; and then it lost sight of the neophyte. But it heard of him again; and the day came when he had leavened the whole Establishment, and when his voice held men of many minds and all communions as by a spell. From Lord Coleridge and Mr. John Morley, from Dean Church and Mr. Kegan Paul, from Mr. R. H. Hutton ("I have now for twenty years held him, as a journalist, to be a good friend of mine," wrote the Cardinal to me in 1884) and Mr. Froude, from Mr. Augustine Birrell and Mr. W. E. Henley, from Mr. Aubrey de Vere and Mr. Burnand, from Miss Christina Rossetti and

Dean Stanley, from Sir Francis Doyle and Lord Blachford, from Professor St. George Mivart and Principal Shairp, from Mr. Lilly and Mr. Gosse, from all the critics of all the schools and all the creeds, came one concordant voice in praise of John Henry Newman as author and as man.

> Sweetly the light
> Shines from the solitary peak at Edgbaston,

sang Coventry Patmore, who understood that even the polemical pamphleteer of 1874 had "peace in heart" though "wrath in hand," and that his most trenchant paragraphs were the "gold blazonries of Love irate," and never "the black flag of Hate."

These names represent "light and leading," men with minds and pens "beautiful and swift." But, O phenomenon! the mass walked and even ran with its masters. The young lions of the *Daily Telegraph* roared out praise. James Macdonell, the type in sayings and doings of everything Newman was not, avows that his "admiration for the saint-like beauty of Newman's character, for the exquisite character of his genius, for his wonderful insight into human nature, for his marvellous command over the resources of the literary art, is such that I never think of him without mentally lifting my hat in token of my reverence." He was "specially fond of reading Newman's writings aloud on Sunday afternoons," and "his favourite hymn was 'Lead, kindly Light!'" Yet, "it is the testimony of her who knew him best that the question of his own salvation never troubled him." So it happens that many admired Newman for his accidents and his accessories, without even hearing the essential message of his life. That can be best summed up in the words he once addressed to the Anglican clergy: "I want to make you anxious about your souls." And vain as in death would all praise have sounded on his ears that was not based on the recognition of this as his only hope and ambition; of this as the end for which he wrote as fervently, as individually, as he prayed.

THE MOSAIC LEGISLATION.

BY THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

From *The Sunday-School Times*, Philadelphia, August 30, 1890.

THE legislative Books of the Pentateuch, from Exodus to Deuteronomy, may be contemplated either in the light (1) of their credentials, or (2) of their character and contents.

The Christian Church, which had heretofore regarded them as an integral and instructive part of the Divine Revelation, is now challenged by the voices of numerous critics to defend them. Champions in this cause are not wanting; and it is not to be supposed that the learned in linguistic studies have, any more than the learned in natural science, arrived at unanimous and final conclusions in these grave matters. What is understood to be at issue is the date and authorship of the Books in the form in which we now have them. These are contested by the negative school on grounds of language and style, upon which none can properly attempt to follow or to judge them unless when equipped with the same special knowledge. They also allege, as parts of the destructive argument, that the Books contain anachronisms, contradictions, statements disproved by history. They have been challenged by Dr. Cave* to set forth a plain and distinct statement of these, such as might bring the allegations in some degree within the circles of knowledge and judgment for us who are not experts, but are supposed to be endued with ordinary intelligence. They are also invited to state what meaning they assign to the standing phrase, "And the Lord spake unto Moses," which with its variants occurs, it may be observed, thirty times in the twenty-seven chapters of Leviticus. And, finally, they are invited by Dr. Cave to show why it is unreasonable to suppose that the Books were contemporaneous with the events described, and grew up one by one along with those events.

It seems but reasonable that we who stand outside the learned world, and who find operations are in progress which are often declared to have destroyed the authority of these ancient books, should be supplied, as far as may be, with the means of rationally judging the nature and grounds of the impeachment. And it is unfortunate that this has been little thought of, and that while we are, it may almost be said, drenched with the deductions and conclusions of the negative critics, it is still so difficult, in multitudes of instances, to come at a clear view of the reasons on which they build. The matters of style and language we must contentedly take upon trust; but anachronism, contradiction of history, contradiction in the Books themselves, ought to be more or less within our cognizance. And there are many arguments of historical verisimilitude and likelihood, which are in no sense the exclusive property of specialism.

---

* *Contemporary Review*, April, 1890, p. 551.

Even within the compass of the Torah, a distinction has been drawn by some eminent critics (by Eichhorn, for example), in their writings on the canon of the Old Testament,[*] who have assigned the legislative portion to Moses himself, and the historical part to scribes acting under his direction or at a later time. It does not appear easy to show why this singular admixture of the two should have been made, unless by or under the direction of the lawgiver himself. His mixed and evidently hard-pressed life would account for a form of authorship, which is not in itself at all convenient. But the ordinary reader will not fail to observe that it is the legislation for which in the sacred text itself the claim is constantly made of being due to direct communication from above,[†] while no corresponding assertion in general accompanies the historical recitals. Speaking at large, every imaginable difference has prevailed among the critics themselves as to the source, date, and authorship of the Books. But, on the whole, the negative movement has brought them gradually toward later epochs; to Samuel, to the age of David, to the severance of the kingdoms, to Josiah, to the Captivity, and those who followed it. The affirmative side has been also stoutly maintained,[‡] not without the admission of particular additions and interpolations. The distinction between substantial authorship and final editorship was largely recognized by writers of celebrity and weight. Bleek himself, sustained by Wellhausen as late as 1886, held that Moses had a hand (*einen Antheil*) in the legislative books. Many of the laws are without sense or purpose, except in regard to circumstances which disappeared with the Mosaic period.[§] Several sections of this important work[‖] are given to the indication of portions of the books which must have been Mosaic. Further, we have this remarkable declaration. Though the entire Pentateuch in its present form should not have been the work of Moses, and though many laws are the product of a later age, still the legislation, in its spirit and character as a whole, is genuinely Mosaic;[¶] and in dealing with the Pentateuch we stand, at least as to the three middle books, upon historical ground,[*] evidently meaning upon historical ground as opposed to that which is unauthenticated or legendary. And what is thus generally asserted of the spirit and character of the Pentateuchal laws, is asserted for an important share of them[†] as to both the contents and even the form.

These statements—it would not be fair to call them admissions—go to the root of the whole matter, and leave us in possession of that for which alone I contend; namely, that the heart and substance of the legislative and institutional system delivered to us in the Pentateuch is historically trustworthy. If this be so, it still remains highly important to distinguish by critical examination what, if any, particular portions of the work in its actual form may be open to question as secondary errors or as developments appended to the original formation; but the citadel, so long victoriously held by faith and reason, both through Hebrew and through Christian ages, remains unassailed, and the documents of Holy Writ emerge substantially unhurt from the inquisitive and searching analysis of the modern time.

There is a later work of Wellhausen's ("Die Composition des Hexateuch's und der Historischen Bücher." Berlin, 1889) which minutely subdivides the Books into minute portions, and refers these to their different authors, with a confidence which appears to be remarkable, but of which I am not a fit judge. I may observe, however, that this work has neither introduction nor conclusion, neither index nor table of contents, and that it resembles rather the promiscuous gatherings of a note-book, or rather, of two note-books crossing one another, discharged bodily into a printing-office, than a work of regular or scientific criticism. I must add that in certain cases, where the unity of the text is disputed upon grounds alike cognizable by all, I find the conclusions of the author as disputable as they are confident. In other instances, numerous enough, assertions are made, as if they were oracles, without the slightest explanation, or any indication of their grounds. Examples of these methods may be found in the criticisms[‡] on Genesis, and in the contradiction alleged to exist in the several accounts of Caleb and Joshua (Num. 32 : 5; Deut. 1 : 32–38).

A still more negative utterance, if I understand it rightly, is found in the "Prolegomena to the History of Israel," translated under the author's supervision, and accompanied with his article on Israel from the Encyclopædia Britannica.* This book, published since the edition of Bleek *cum* Wellhausen from which I have quoted, appears, strangely enough, to contradict it, and announces that "the Mosaic history is not the starting-point for the history of ancient Israel, but for the history of Judaism." † The distinction may not be familiar to English readers, but the meaning appears to be that the Pentateuch had not, either in form or substance, any operative existence until after the Exile, when the ancient Israel is held to end, and Judaism to begin. A "Mosaic germ" only is admitted, and a germ is that which, like an unborn child, has no operative existence, but only the promise of producing one. Israel then lived for nine hundred years from the Exodus, and transmitted a peculiar faith, law, ritual, and nationality, without any legislative and constitutional system to uphold any one of them. Those are doubtless perfectly sincere who represent this as a method of progressive revelation. But there are also those who think that such a progressive revelation as this would for over two thousand years have palmed upon the whole Jewish and Christian world a heartless imposture. It is more immediately necessary to observe that the hypothesis is one reaching far beyond the province of specialism, and requiring to be tested at a number of points by considerations more broadly historical. Nor can I quit the subject without observing that it is extremely difficult to learn whether there is any real standing ground which the present negative writers mean not only to occupy, but to hold. Almost any representation of their views may be either supported or contradicted by citing particular expressions from their works. All we can do is to dive as best we may into their conception of what Wellhausen rather singularly calls "the secrets" of his art.‡ Upon the whole, and taking the article on Israel in the Encyclopædia Britannica as the fairest exposition of his views, I infer that the present fashion is to believe in Moses, but to question even his connection with the Decalogue,§ to allow him to have given or suggested something totally indefinite to the Israelites, and to hold that the materials of the legislative books gradually grew up out of material supplied upon occasion by the priests, like the "Answers of Experts," * which supplied a contribution to the Code of Justinian, into a state which enabled editors, generally post-exilic, to reduce them to their present form. This scheme seems to be admirably represented by the words which Mr. Robertson Smith quotes with high authority as its gist. And this is the scheme to which I desire, on historical grounds, to demur.

---

[*] A most convenient summary of the history of Criticism on the Pentateuch is supplied by Bleek *cum* Wellhausen in the *Einleitung* (Ed. 1886), sections 13–17. Wellhausen adds another review at the close of the volume in this edition.

[†] So Wellhausen in the *Einleitung*, sect. 18, p. 40.

[‡] *Ibid.*, sect. 15. [§] *Ibid.*, sect. 11. [‖] *Ibid.*, sect. 13–24.

[¶] "*So muss doch die darin enthaltene Gesetzgebung ihrem ganzen Geiste und Character nach echt mosaisch sein.*"—*Ibid.*, sect. 22, p. 45.

[*] *Einleitung*. [†] Sect. 23, p. 46. [‡] Page 7.

At the same time it is undeniable that, even if the outside negative conclusions were still such as they were stated to be so lately as in 1886, yet the impression they had created was not of a similarly limited character. Whether owing to the predisposition of the time, or to a spirit latent in some of the critics, or to the reaction which is usually perceptible when certain ideas long cherished on one side have been found to require modification, there have been, as it were, exhalations from the recent inquiries extending outwards in their effect much beyond the positive conclusions. An atmosphere has been diffused around us, and we habitually inhale it, which inspires a general uncertainty, leading to negation, with respect to the Mosaic books. This causes us, not, perhaps, to believe (for this would imply and demand a rational process), but to feel towards these great foundation-books as if we believed, that, instead of being as to the heart and pith of them trustworthy, they were in the main untrustworthy; that they were compounded or composed at uncertain times, by uncertain authors, from uncertain materials; that even bad faith is to be traced in them; and that the question is not so much what particulars can be convicted of unauthenticity, as whether any particulars can be rescued from the general discredit of a mythical or legendary character. It is against this vague, irrational, unscientific method of proceeding that I would enter not protest only, but a pleading. Whatever is to happen, let not Christians lose unawares either their faith, or that pillar of their faith which the great Books of the Old Testament ever have supplied.

I have already made it clear that I yield, as matter of course, to the conclusions of linguists in their own domain, not only respectful attention, but provisional assent. That domain includes not only criticism strictly textual, but all that relates to style, and, in a word, whatever properties of any given writings are developed through the medium of the particular tongue in which they are composed. On the mere form of the Books they speak with a force which, as against us, the unlearned, is overwhelming. But in the examinations directed to the matter as opposed to the form, their authority is of a less stringent character. The historical aspects and relations which open out this field are not theirs exclusively, and we may canvass and question their conclusions, as it is open to us to do with the conclusions of Macaulay or of Grote.

---

* Edinburgh: A. & C. Black, 1885.

† Preface by Professor Robertson Smith, p. v.

‡ *Einleitung*, Ed. 1886, Vorwort.

§ Wellhausen, Hist. Israel (Black), p. 436, 509.

* Gibbon (Milman's ed.), iv., 193.

When it is attempted to bring down the books of the Pentateuch from the time of Moses, by whom they profess to have been written, to the period of the Babylonian captivity, and this not only as to their literary form, but as to their substance, the evident meaning and effect of the attempt is to divest them of an historical and to invest them with a legendary character.

At the same time, it should be borne in mind that those who have not seen reason to adopt the negation theory above described, leave entirely open numerous questions belonging to the institutions of the Israelites. It is not extravagant to assume that laws given to them as a nomad people, and then subjected to the varying contingencies of history for many centuries, may, or even must, have required and received adaptation by supplement, development, or change in detail, which the appointed guides of the people were authorized and qualified to supply, not in derogation, but rather in completion and in furtherance of the work of Moses, which remained his in essence from first to last.

It is admitted, however, that the whole question must be tried on historical and literary grounds. On such grounds I seek to approach it, and to learn by testing what in the main is fact, what in the main is speculation, and to a great extent fluctuating and changeful speculation.

It is never to be forgotten that our point of departure is from the ground of established historic fact. The existence of Moses is even better, and far better, established than that of Lycurgus. We know Lycurgus in the main from the great fact of his very peculiar institutions. They, such as we find them in historic times, compel us to presume his existence in a prehistoric time. Not only their high and elaborate organization, but their practical efficacy in separating and fencing off from the rest of Greece the Spartan community, reduces to something near absurdity any such supposition as that they were only a late growth reached by imperceptible degrees. We know Moses as well from his institutions, by no means less peculiar, and, as experience has shown, far more durable. But in the case of Moses we have much evidence independent of, and anterior to, the institutions themselves in their historic form. Yet no one doubts either the existence of the Spartan lawgiver, or the general character of his personal work. If the form of the books in which the Mosaic legislation reaches us be open to the suspicion of manipulation by scribes or editors, or if it suggest some suspicion of developments, how does this compare with Lycurgus, about or from whom we have no books at all?

The exodus from Egypt, the settlement in Palestine, the foundation there of institutions, civil and religious, which were endowed with a tenacity of life and a peculiarity of character beyond all example,—these things are established by Scripture, but they are also established independent of Scripture. They contribute a *trinodis necessitas,* a threefold combination of fact, which, in order to make them intelligible and coherent, in order to supply a rational connection between cause and effect, require not only a Moses, but such a Moses as the Scripture supplies. They build up a niche, which the Scripture fills. At all times of history, and specially in those primitive times, when* the men made the countries, not the countries the men, these great independent historic facts absolutely carry with them the assumption of a leader, a governor, a legislator. All this simply means a Moses, and a Moses such as we know him from the Pentateuch.

And this leads us, I do not say to, but towards, the conclusion that whatever be the disparaging allegations of the critics, they must, after all, in all likelihood turn upon matters of form or of detail, but that the substance of the history is in thorough accordance with the historic bases that are laid for us in profane as well as in sacred testimony. If so, then we have also to bear in mind that the phenomenon is most peculiar, and could only have been exhibited to the world as the offspring of a peculiar generating cause. A people of limited numbers, of no marked political genius, negative and stationary as to literature and art, maintain themselves for near a thousand years, down to the Captivity, placed in the immediate neighborhood, and subject to the attacks, of the great Eastern monarchies, as well as of some very warlike neighbors. They receive the impress of a character, so marked, that not even the Captivity can efface it, but, on the contrary, helps to give a harder and sharper projection to its features. It retains its solidity and substance while everything else, including great political aggregations, such as the Hittite monarchy, becomes gradually fused in the surrounding masses ; and this even when it has been subjected to conditions such as at Babylon, apparently sufficient to beat down and destroy the most obstinate nationalism. Can it be denied that this great historic fact, nowhere to be matched, is in thorough accordance with, and almost of itself compels us to presuppose, the existence from the outset of an elaborately detailed and firmly compacted system of laws and institutions, under which this peculiar discipline might gradually shape, determine, and mature the character of the people ?

---

* So Montesquieu, in his "Esprit des Loix."

Wherever we turn, we seem to find the broad and lucid principles of historical likelihood asserting themselves in favor of the substance of the legislative books, apart from questions of detail and literary form.

In its great stages, we are entitled to treat the matter of the narrative books as history entitled to credit. An elaborate organization with a visible head and an hereditary succession is, after a long lapse of time, substituted for a regimen over Israel, of which the main springs had been personal eminence and moral force. It is represented in the Scripture, and it seems obvious, that the transition from this patriarchal republicanism to monarchy was in the nature of a religious retrogression. It showed an increasing incapacity to walk by faith, and a craving for an object of sight as a substitute for the Divine Majesty apprehended by spiritual insight, and habitually conceived of as the head of the civil community. This view of the relative condition of republican and of regal Israel is confirmed by the fact that, with the monarchy, came in another regular organization, —that of the schools of the prophets. Prophecy, which, for the present purpose, we may consider as preaching, instead of appearing as occasion required, became a system, with provision for perpetual succession. That is to say, the people could not be kept up to the primitive, or even the necessary, level in belief and life without the provision of more elaborate and direct means of instruction, exhortation, and reproof, than had at first been requisite.

Notwithstaning the existence of those means, and the singular and noble energy of the prophets, the proofs of the decline are not less abundant than painful, in the wickedness of most of the sovereigns, and in the almost wholesale and too constant lapse of the Israelites into the filthy idolatry which was rooted in the country. And again, it is not a little remarkable that the enumeration by name of the great historic heroes of faith in the Epistle to the Hebrews ends in the person of King David,[*] with the first youth of the monarchy. The only later instances referred to are the prophets, named as a class, who stood apart and alone, and were not, as a rule, leaders of the people, but rather witnesses in sackcloth against their iniquities. Taking the history from the Exodus to the Exile as a whole, the latter end was worse than the beginning, the cup of iniquity was full, it had been filled by a gradual process ; and one of the marks of that process was a lowering of the method in which the chosen people were governed ; it became more human and less divine.

Under these circumstances, does it not appear like a paradox, and even a rather wanton paradox, to refer the production of those sacred Mosaic books, which constituted the charter of the Hebrews as a separate and peculiar people, to the epochs of a lowered and decaying spiritual life ? They formed the base on which the entire structure rested. It is hardly possible to separate the fabric from its foundation. Had they not been recorded and transmitted, it would have been reasonable, perhaps necessary, for us to presume their existence. They could only spring from a plant full of vigorous life, not from one comparatively sickly, corrupt, and exhausted.

And so again we have, in the historic Moses, a great and powerful genius, an organizing and constructing mind. Degenerate ages cannot equip and furnish forth illustrious founders, only at the most the names and shadows of them. Moses stands in historic harmony with his work. But we are now sometimes asked to sever the work from the worker, and to refer it to some doubtful and nameless person ; whereas it is surely obvious or probable that the author of a work so wonderful and so far beyond example, so elaborate in its essential structure, and so designed for public use, could hardly fail to associate his name with it as if written upon a rock, and with a pen of iron. For, be it recollected, that name was the seal and stamp of the work itself. According to its own testimony, he was the *apostolos*,[†] the messenger, who brought it from God and gave it to the people. If the use of his name was a fiction, it was one of those fictions which are falsehoods, for it altered essentially the character of the writings to which it was attached.

---

[*] Heb. 11 : 32.

[†] Exod. 19 : 16–25, and *passim*.

Supposing it to be granted that this or that portion of the legislative books may have been an addition in the way of development, of an appendage and supplement to a scheme already existing, how and why came it to be placed under the shelter of the great name of Moses, but because that name had already acquired and consolidated its authority from its being inseparably attached to the original gift of the law?

Even so it was that, when the great and wonderful poems known as the Iliad and Odyssey had given to the name of Homer a surpassing celebrity, and other works of less exalted rank sought for fame by claiming him as their author, the simple fact that they so claimed him of itself supplied the proof that Homer was traditionally, and from immemorial time, taken to be the author of those greater works at the time when the lesser ones were imputed to him. If the title of Mosaic authorship was ever in any case attached to what Moses did not produce, the ascription was made in order to gain credit for the new supplemental matter, and showed that, at the date when it was made, there was an older and immemorial belief in his being the author of the work whereto the supplement was appended.

As we stand on historical ground in assuming that Moses was a great man, and a powerful agent in the Hebrew history, so we stand on a like basis in pointing to the fact that, from the captivity onwards (I say nothing of the prior period, as it would beg the question), the Jewish nation paid to the five books of the Pentateuch a special and extraordinary regard, even beyond the rest of their sacred books. These were known as the Torah; and the fact of this special reverence is one so generally acknowledged, that it may without discussion be safely assumed as a point of departure.

Before, then, any sort of acceptance or acquiescence is accorded to notions which virtually consign to insignificance the most ancient of our sacred books, let us well weigh the fact that the devout regard of the Hebrews for the Torah took the form, at or very soon after the Exile, of an extreme vigilance on behalf of these particular books as distinct from all others. This vigilance, which, at a later epoch, reached its climax under the Massoretes, very naturally began, or greatly advanced, at the time when the nation or its leading classes, having for the time lost their temple and their home, clung more closely than ever to the written Word in their sacred books; to its body either more, or not less, than to its spirit.

So early as in the days of Hezekiah there is said to have been a restorative process of some kind performed upon the text of the law, as well as upon the temple and its doors.* That clinging affection to the Word, which the Captivity could not fail to stimulate in pious minds, took effect after the Return in the establishment of positive institutions for its care; which, indeed, had become a necessity in consequence of the change of language, unless it were to be wholly lost to the people. Hence we have the Jewish tradition of a Great Synagogue, founded with this view. A guild of scribes was appointed to copy, preserve, and expound the Divine Word,† and the Canon of the Old Testament appears during the same period to have assumed something of a regular form. Soon grew up the Massorah, or body of traditions concerning the text of the Torah, which is supposed to have become noticeable from about 300 B.C.,‡ and which, in after ages, gave a name to the Massoretes, official students and guardians of the text. This body is one without a parallel in the history of the world. Its existence not only afforded strong special securities for the faithful custody of the text from the date when its operations commenced, but it also bears witness to a profound and exacting veneration for the Ancient Books which presupposes an unquestioning traditional belief in their antiquity and authenticity.

The Jews, perhaps exclusively among the early peoples, distinguished broadly between the matter and the corporeal form of a book, between its soul and its body. They alone conceived the idea of using the material form of the words and letters as an instrument for insuring the conservation of the contents. If (such was their conception) we secure the absolute identity of the manuscripts, and reckon up the actual numbers of the words they contain, and of the letters which compose the words, then we shall render change in them impossible and conservation certain. Thus, for example, the words in the Book of Psalms were counted, and the middle word of the book was known. The letters in each word were also counted, and the middle letter was known. Rules for writing, placing, and arranging were laid down; readings were noted as *kethibh* and *kere;* as what was in the text, and as what ought to be in the text, but, from a reverent unwillingness to alter, only took its place upon the margin. The Hebrews were the only people who built up by degrees a regular scientific method of handling the material forms in which the substance of their sacred books was clothed, and this system had begun to grow from the time when a special reverence is known to have been concentrated upon the Torah. It may have commenced before the Captivity. It may have preceded, and may probably have been enhanced by, the division of the kingdoms. It must have been in great force when, soon after the Captivity, schools of scribes were entrusted with the custody of the text of the law as a study apart from that of its meaning. Now, in our time, we are asked or tempted by the negative criticism to believe that all this reverence for the books of the Pentateuch, having primarily the sense for its object, but abounding and overflowing so as to embrace the corporeal vehicle, was felt towards a set of books not substantially genuine, but compounded and made up by recent operators who may be mildly called editors, but who were rather clandestine authors. Is this probable or reasonable? Is it even possible that these books of recent concoction, standing by the side of some among the prophetical books possessing a greater antiquity, should nevertheless have attracted to themselves, and have permanently retained, an exceptional and superlative veneration, such as surely presumes a belief in the remoteness of their date, the genuineness of their character, and their title to stand as the base, both doctrinal and historic, of the entire Hebrew system?

---

* Paterson Smyth, "The Old Documents," p. 42.

† *Ibid.*, p. 66.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

The result of this negative criticism ought to be viewed in its extreme form, and this for several reasons: such as that with the lapse of time it continually adopts new negations; that the more conservative of the schools exhibit to us no principle which separates them in the mass from the bolder disintegration; and that what is now the *ultima thule* of the system may a short time hence appear only to have been a stage on the way to positions as yet undreamt of. So viewing the subject, do we not find that it comes to this: not merely that the Mosaic laws received secondary supplements or amendments from time to time, but that the entire fabric had grown up anonymously as well as recently, and that it rests upon no guarantee whatever, either of time or of place or of personal authority?

I have already endeavored to show the historic improbability that an upstart production could have leaped into an estimation such as belongs to a firm tradition and a general credit of antiquity. And now let us look for a moment at the rather crude and irregular form of the Mosaic books from Exodus to Deuteronomy. Taken as a whole, they have not that kind of consistency which belongs to consecutiveness of form, and which almost uniformly marks both historical and legal documents. They mix narrative and legislation; they pass from one to the other without any obvious reason. They repeat themselves in a manner which seems to exclude the idea that they had undergone the careful and reflective reviews, the comparison of part with part, which is generally bestowed upon works of great importance, completed with comparative leisure, and intended for the guidance not only of an individual but of a people. They are even accused of contradictions. They appear to omit adjustments necessary in the light of subsequent history; such, for instance, as we might desire between the sweeping proscription not only of image worship, but of images or shapen corporeal forms, in the Second Commandment, and the use actually made of them in the temple, and the singular case of the serpent destroyed by Hezekiah.* It seems not difficult to account for this roughness and crudeness of authorship under the circumstances of changeful nomad life, and the constant pressure of anxious executive or judicial functions, combined with the effort of constructing a great legislative code, which required a totally different attitude of mind. The life of Moses, as it stands in the sacred text, must have been habitually a life of extraordinary, unintermitted strain, and one without remission of that strain even near and at the close. As some anomalies in the composition of the Koran may be referable to the circumstances of the life of Mahomet,† so we may apply a like idea to the shape of the legislative books. It is not difficult to refer the anomalies of such authorship to the incidents of such a life, and to conceive that any changes which have found their way into the text may yet have been such as to leave unimpaired what may be called the originality as well as the integrity of its character. But how do these considerations hold if we are to assume as our point of departure the hypothesis of the negative extremists? Under that supposition the legislative books were principally not adjusted, but composed, and this not only in a manner which totally falsifies their own solemn and often-repeated declarations, but which supposes something like hallucination on the part of a people that accepted such novelties as ancient. In addition to all this, they assumed their existing form, so wanting as to series and method, in a settled state of things, in an old historic land, with an unbounded freedom of manipulation, at any rate with no restraint imposed by respect for original form, and with every condition in favor of the final editors which could favor the production of a thoroughly systematic and orderly work. Does it not seem that if the preparation and presentation of the Hebrew code took place at the time and in the way imposed on us by the doctrine of the thorough disintegrationist, then we stand entirely at a loss to account for the form of the work before us? And, conversely, do not the peculiarities of that form constitute an objection to the negative hypothesis, which it is an absolute necessity for its promoters to get rid of as best they can?

---

* 2 Kings 18: 4.

† See Rodwell's Preface to the Koran respecting the Suras.

Let me again illustrate the case by referring to the Iliad. Those who have referred that work to a variety of authors have had recourse to subtle and questionable arguments in order to exhibit some semblance of anomaly, and have always been allowed to assume that the final editors under Pericles, or at whatever epoch, wrought with energy and purpose to weld the fragmentary material into a seemly whole. Is it conceivable that an operation such as we are now required to believe in could have been carried on without the sense of a similar necessity, or could so absolutely have failed in literary aim and effort?

I subjoin one further topic of the same class as fit to be taken into view. The absence from the legislative books of all assertion of a future state, and of all motive derived from it with a view to conduct, has been already noticed. The probable reason of that absence from a code of laws framed by Moses under Divine command or guidance, is a subject alike of interest and difficulty. It has sometimes occurred to me as possible that the close connection of the doctrine with public religion in the Egyptian system might have supplied a reason for its disconnection from the Mosaic laws* even as I suppose we might, from other features of those laws, draw proof or strong presumption that, among the purposes of the legislator, there was included a determination to draw a broad and deep line, or even trench, of demarcation, between the foreign religions in their neighborhood and the religious system of the Hebrews. Be this as it may, it is enough for my present purpose that the absence of the doctrine of a future state from the work cannot be held to discredit the Mosaic authorship. But does not that absence clearly discredit the idea of a post-exilic authorship? Is it conceivable that Hebrews, proceeding to frame their legislative books, after the Captivity, and long after the Dispersion of the Ten Tribes, and after the light which these events had thrown upon the familiar ideas of a future life and an Underworld, as held both in the East and in Egypt, could have excluded all notice of it from their system of laws? I propose this as another topic for reflection. If they could not so have excluded it, then the fact of the exclusion becomes another difficulty in the way of our accepting any negative hypothesis concerning the substance of the legislative books.

It seems, then, that it is difficult to reconcile the results of the negative criticism on the Pentateuch with the known reverence of the Jews for their Torah, which appears absolutely to presuppose a tradition of immemorial age on its behalf, as a precondition of such universal and undoubting veneration. But if this be necessary in the case of the Jew, how much more peremptorily is it required by the case of the Samaritan, and what light does that case throw upon the general question? In medieval times, and until the seventeenth century, Christendom knew nothing of a Samaritan testimony to the authenticity of the Mosaic books, excepting from certain slight references in the works of Fathers to "the ancient Hebrew according to the Samaritans." But early in the seventeenth century a traveller found among the Samaritans of Damascus a copy of the Pentateuch in the ancient Hebrew letters, and we are told there are now about sixteen of these manuscripts in the European libraries. The chief one in existence is guarded with sacred care at Nablous, the ancient Shechem, by a congregation, still surviving, of a few hundred Samaritans.* For questions of textual accuracy this work is esteemed inferior to the Hebrew, though it is not wholly without a claim to more archaic forms.

The Samaritan Pentateuch is one of the most remarkable monuments of antiquity. Its testimony, of course, cannot be adduced to show that the books following the Pentateuch have been clothed from a very ancient date with the reverence due to the Divine Word, and is even capable of being employed, in a limited sense, the other way. But as respects the Samaritan Pentateuch itself, how is it possible to conceive that it should have held as a Divine work the supreme place in the regard of the Samaritans, if, about or near the year 500 B.C.,* or, again, if at the time of Manasseh the seceder † it had, as matter of fact, been a recent compilation of their enemies the Jews? or if it had been regarded as anything less than a record of a great revelation from God, historically known, or at the least universally believed, to have come down to them in the shape it then held from antiquity? Be it remembered that this work itself, and an approximate date for its known existence, are not matters of mere speculation, but are accepted results of historical research. And it is in this as in other cases a matter for serious consideration, whether we can accept the ingenious conclusions of critics before we know whether they are to be shattered and shivered when flung against the face of the strong rock of history.

---

* This topic is touched by Bishop Alexander in his Bampton Lectures.

* See Paterson Smyth, p. 118.

The Samaritan Pentateuch, then, forms in itself a remarkable indication, even a proof, that, at the date from which we know it to have been received, the Pentateuch was no novelty among the Jews. But may we not state the argument in broader terms? Surely the reverence of the Samaritans for the Torah could not have begun at this period; hardly could have begun at any period posterior to the schism. If these books grew by gradual accretion, still that must have been a single accretion. A double process could not have been carried on in harmony. Nor can we easily suppose that, when the Ten tribes separated from the Two, they did not carry with them the law on which their competing worship was to be founded. In effect, is there any rational supposition except that the kingdom of Israel had possessed at the time of Rehoboam some code corresponding in substance, in all except mere detail, with that which was subsequently written out in the famous manuscripts we now possess?

Let us close this portion of the subject with a plea of a different order,—one which, admitting a probable imperfection of the text, deprecates, as opposed to the principles of sound criticism, any conclusion therefrom adverse to its general fidelity. It has caused me some surprise to notice (1) that some negative writers lay considerable stress upon what they deem to be numerical errors in the books of the Old Testament; and (2) that, so far as I have seen, they do not advert to the increased risks of mistake in the transmission of numbers as compared with other literary matter, either by copying or by word of mouth.

The increased risk which accompanies all recording of numbers extends likewise to enumerations, such as genealogical or other recitals of names in lists, subject, however, to the remark that, where meter is used, inasmuch as it supplies a framework for particular words which would not apply to other words, the danger is proportionably less; and also that, where the record is by writing, and not by simple hearing, the eye has the opportunity of traversing the names as the mechanical process is carried on, which will in many cases stand in connection with, and so serve to check, one another.

Bishop Colenso, for example, lays very great stress on the numbers assigned by the Old Testament to the children of Israel on their passage through the desert, and, observing on the practical difficulties which such a multitude must encounter on a march, treats the case as one which materially impugns the general credit of the history.*

I suppose that those who are practically conversant with the movement of men in large bodies may be much inclined to follow Colenso in questioning the statements of numbers, both there and in many other cases. It is quite another question whether, because errors may have crept into the numbers, the recitals of facts generally are therefore untrustworthy.

There is a broad and clear difference, of which note ought to be taken. Both in copying and in writing, as a general rule, the structure of the sentence, or what is called the context, is mentally carried onwards, and the general drift confines within narrow limits the possibility of error in the particular words. Mistake in form would very commonly betray itself by inconsistency in the sense; and this inconsistency would not fail to be detected, because the relation between the parts of the sentence is ordinarily perceived as the process is carried on. But the relation between numerical amounts is not at once determined for the copyist by the context, and usually requires a distinct and careful examination.

---

* Paterson Smyth, p. 49.

† Placed by Wellhausen at about 375 B.C. "Hist. Israel." (Black). Page 498.

* See Colenso on the Pentateuch and Joshua, Part 1, XII., *et alibi*.

I will give two practical illustrations of this statement, the one very old, and the other very modern; the one touching oral, and the other written, transmission.

The most elaborate invocation of the Muse, or appeal for divine assistance, in the whole of the Poems of Homer, is the preface to the Catalogue of the Greek troops and ships; and this, although in no part of the poems could less of effort properly poetic be required. But the Catalogue consists partly of numerical statements of the strength of the contingents which made up the fleet, partly of geographical detail of the names of towns and districts; and here we find the *rationale* of the poet's call for special aid, and care with a view to accuracy; and this although he had meter to assist him.

I now turn to very modern practice. In the year 1853 it was my duty for the first time to submit to Parliament one of the large and complex statements of the public accounts for the year, which are associated in our country with the familiar name of Budgets. The speeches in which these statements were contained were made known to the country by reporting in the usual manner. But the art of the reporters could not be trusted to convey the figures with accuracy by the ear, and a practice had consequently grown up of supplying them from the official source in carefully written statements for their guidance, which were sent to them during the delivery of the speech. It has now been found more convenient not to trust at all to the ear, and the minister is understood to speak from printed figures.

My position does not go beyond this, that the same care which insures general fidelity of statement in recitals does not suffice to secure numerical precision; and conversely, that the want of such precision, which may often be suspected in the Old Testament, does not raise presumptions adverse to general correctness.

The necessary limits of this paper do not permit of my entering on the contents of the Mosaic legislation. It is, I apprehend, both far more complex and far deeper than the other systems of ancient law known to us, as well as far higher in its moral aims. I humbly recommend that those who read it should fix their minds upon the skill with which it is addressed to the attainment of ends of such a nature as to render them in their ordinary aspects hardly reconcilable. Severely proscriptive of the stranger, —namely, the nations whom it found in possession of Canaan,—it is as singularly liberal and generous toward him when he has made his peace with Hebraism. Aiming much at equality, simplicity, and industry, as fountains of order and of strength, it embodies most peculiar regulations for the purpose of keeping within narrow limits the growth of wealth, which is their natural result; and the spirit of enterprise, which would have burst the narrow bounds of Palestine, and destroyed the seclusion of the chosen people by premature mixture with the nations of the world. The design seemingly was to repress the latent powers of human nature, and to secure a conservative, even a stationary, community, changeless as the truths of which it was the guardian. The completeness of their severance was not impaired by the Captivity and Dispersion of Israel, or by the Exile in Babylon, or by the creation of Jewish factories abroad, or by the destruction of the political independence of the country, or by the invasion and supremacy of the Greek language. The Jew, when our Lord came, was still, and was even more than ever, the Jew; and so, though it may have been despite of himself, the purpose of his great stewardship was accomplished.

London, England.

THE PARADOX OF DEATH AND LIFE.

SHORT SUNDAY READINGS FOR SEPTEMBER.

BY THE BISHOP OF RIPON (RT. REV. DR. WILLIAM BOYD CARPENTER).

From *Good Words*, London, September, 1890.

FIRST SUNDAY.

Read St. John xii. 20–33.

DEATH YET LIFE.

"I have been crucified with Christ, yet I live."—GAL. ii. 20.

A PARADOX is often the highest expression of truth; the contradiction in terms only veils the deepest harmony in fact. This explains the use of the paradox by human wisdom. Philosophy and the common experience of men have employed it to give utterance to their maxims.

Religion, too, has her paradoxes. "He that saveth his life shall lose it." "There is that scattereth and yet increaseth." In statements like these religion has sought to give voice to her most cherished beliefs.

St. Paul draws our attention to the profoundest principles of spiritual life in the paradox of the text: "I am crucified, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ." There is a double paradox here—a paradox of life and death: "I am crucified, nevertheless I live;" a paradox of exchanged personality: "Yet not I, but Christ." This is natural, for religion is a life and a love. As it is a life, it has its paradox of a death which is yet a life; and as it is a love, it has its paradox of love, or what we have called exchanged personality.

There is the paradox of life and death. This may be understood by remembering the way in which life unfolds to most of us. It is a constant unveiling of a life beneath life; it is the discovery of ever-deepening mysteries of existence. The eye of the child sees life mainly in sensible objects, and draws thoughts from things material; it perceives the life of outer form—the outline, the colour, the size. To the child, life lies in the beauty of the flower, the gay hue of the butterfly, the splendour of nature's robe; but after a while, knowledge comes and reveals the deeper life which lies beneath these forms. Colour, shape, foliage, are but expressions of order which rules the universe; the child's mind has grown: it is alive to the deeper laws of created things.

It is the same with the child's outlook upon the world of human life. Its first thoughts of life's glory are with the external trappings and glittering manifestations of greatness; the gorgeous uniform, the striking decorations of place and office; these the child delights in. But as time moves growing knowledge unfolds the meaning of these things; they are the tokens of a life of social order, in which the child must one day take his part. The life of duty is disclosed to his view. He is no longer to play with the colours of life; he is to work out its true harmony by doing his duty where he is; the canvas is before him: on it he must paint a real, earnestly-conceived picture.

The result of this unfolding of the deeper life to us, is the death of the earlier view of life. The realisation of this truer life makes us heedless of the attractions of the other. The soldier thinks little of the uniform which was once his childish delight, now that the real and serious work of his profession is before him. Courage, discipline, drill, sagacity—these are the elements of his new life of duty; these are his attractions; he is dead to the things which once absorbed his thoughts. The girl forgets her delight in the orange-blossoms of yesterday in the deeper, richer life of her sweet home toil. Her wedded life has unfolded to her new duties; in these she lives; she is dead to many things which once dazzled her; yet she lives in the happy cares and welcome burdens of the house.

Thus as life unfolds to us her deeper veins, we die to the earlier childish joys. And this experience was the Apostle's. The old life had once been a gladness to him; he had been proud of the blue blood of Benjamin, of the strictness of the Pharisaic sect, of the place he held in the Sanhedrim; but when the dawn of a truer life broke on him, he died to the attractions which fascinated him before. When he saw life as Christ revealed it to him, when he saw that his duty lay in alleviating the sorrows and elevating the characters of men, in teaching the despondent of the unwearying love of God, then the things which he once reckoned as gain became but dross to him. The deeper life of the spirit was revealed to him, and he saw that true life did not consist in self-conceit or isolation, in past privileges or present honours, but in growing like to God, and in going forth among men charged with the splendid enterprise of holiness and love. This was his life now; he was dead to the other. He was crucified, yet he lived. But he found—what all must find—that the higher the life, the more bitter the pain; the loftier the duty, the more perilous the performance of it. The old life had no cross in it such as the new one brought. In pursuing the higher, he met the perils of robbers, the perils of waters, the perils of the heathen, the perils among false brethren. It was true; it must be so. None step out of the life of lower or mere childish delights without encountering the peril and the pain; for danger and suffering seem to wait upon the steps of all high-purposed life. and the loftiest duties are encompassed with the sharpest thorns. But none the less, this life is more truly life than the earlier one. There may be hardship, risk, conflict, but the life is nobler, truer than the idle, flower-strewn life which is left behind; and the sharpest pangs would never cause the heroic soul to turn back. Like the sailor tossed upon the stormy deep, he would not change the dangers of the giant waves and creaking timbers for the safe shore fringed by a smiling sea. This is his life; and he lives more truly in danger and duty than in safety and delight. So though the cross be hard to bear, the old uncrossed life had no attractions for the Apostle. "I am crucified, but I live: I have found my life's work; I am content to do it, though at the cost of pain and at the risk of life." Like his Master, he knew that there were the appointed hours of life in which life's work was to be done. Peril must not daunt him, for the work was before him, and He who gave the work would give the needed time to achieve it. And thus not with a weak, blind dependence on a foolish fatalism, but with a loving trust in the divine destiny which governed life, he was strong to encounter all dangers, difficulties, and sufferings. The old dream life of self was gone; the new strong life of suffering and sacrifice was his; in realising it, in living to grow like God, and to work like God, he found the true secret of existence, and of real peace and permanent progress; though the avenue to it was through death, he would not turn back. "I am crucified, nevertheless I live."

SECOND SUNDAY.

Read St. John xvii. 20–26.

THE PARADOX OF AN EXCHANGED PERSONALITY.

"Yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me."—GAL. ii. 20.

But is there not some deeper explanation of this energy of life? Is it only the discovery of a larger and fuller life which makes men content to risk so much? Is there no motive which impels them to this life of heroic peril? I think that there is. The key is supplied in the Apostle's second paradox—"I live, yet not I, but Christ." The paradox of life and death is explained by the paradox of love, or exchanged personality.

With this experience true life begins, for nothing truly finds its life till it has lost its life in another. The often-quoted words of our own Laureate will exhibit the truth of this. He sings that it is

> "Better to have loved and lost
> Than never to have loved at all."

We accept the words; we know that they are true, even in our moments of bitterest heart-ache, and in accepting them we only acknowledge that our life would have missed its fulness if it had never gone forth and lost itself in the love of another. In love we lose ourselves and truly in this loss we find our life.

Nature teaches the same in her myriad illustrations. The sea teems with fugitive life, which only begins to put forth strength and power when it has grasped the rock and knit its life to it. The seed only then begins its true life when it loses itself in the bosom of the earth. The insects building up the reef on the island, the worms giving new vigour to the soil, tell the same story of life found when lost, of the power of existence breaking forth in strength and beauty from life given into the keeping of another.

It is the secret of power in a nation's story. The statesman finds his might in a life absorbed in his country's life. "Not I —not I—but my country lives in me," might well be his language. He has merged himself in his fatherland. Patriotism is a power, because it means the heart of the nation beating in the heart of the individual, and the individual identifying himself with his country's weal.

If thus the paradox finds illustration in the history of a nation, we can see even more clearly its truth in the history of the heart.

> "At the first sight
> They have changed eyes,"

writes Shakespeare, who well knew the depths of the heart, when he described the dawning love of Ferdinand and Miranda. What is this but the same principle again? The life of self absorbed in that of another. The love of wedded life is just that sweet exchange of personality which finds its expression in the mutual cry, "Not I, but he;" "Not I, but she." The moving years of united lives deepen the truth. All work outside in the great busy world is no longer for himself when the worker has a home; all home-work to the wife is wrought in the thought of the bread-winner. This love brightens all interest with new light; the old trifling joys are nothing now, compared with the joy of that life which is one, yet two; which is the life of neither, but of both;—which can no longer be the life of self, but of the other.

And, yet again, the years bring the same principle into play. The mother's life is lost in that of the child; she can truly say —"I no longer live, but the child's life is the life I live." And still as the years roll on the children learn the same truth and become the examples of the same grand paradox; growing knowledge and experience have taught them the meaning of the father's life or the mother's. They begin to appreciate the toil, the pain, the peril, which surround their parents' life, the bond of a common sympathy and common interest is created; they live in the parents' life, they feel with their feelings; they are moved by their danger, because they are absorbed in the love of them. The sweet bonds bind them into that union, which has no other voice save the "Not I, but the mother, the father, the family."

Thus it is that the solidarity of home life and national life gives illustration and example of that grand principle which the Apostle states in the splendid paradox of the text.

This principle of exchanged personality lies, then, at the root of almost all forms and ministries of life; and it has been the moving force in religion. It was the secret of the Baptist's zeal. He was content to lose himself in Him to whom he came to bear witness. His joy was fulfilled in the fresh, glowing glory of Christ, even though his own star sank out of view. "He must increase, I must decrease," was his language, and it was but the anticipation of St. Paul's utterance, "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

There remains, then, but to see how in Christ the same law was true. He, too, exemplified the double paradox. In Him the paradox of life and the paradox of love found their illustration. Alive in the glory of His Father, He became dead to His own glory that He might live for our welfare. He came and took our nature that He might see the world with our eyes and share with us our life's sorrows and griefs. He became man, and beheld life with our eyes, and suffered, identifying Himself with us, losing Himself in us, that we might see all life with His eyes of love and tenderness, that no longer the spirit of self should rule, but that His spirit of love and self-surrender should dwell in us, and send us forth upon our life eager to mitigate men's troubles, to relieve their distresses, to elevate their characters; and that thus His heart and His life should breathe and beat in the holiness and lovingness, and self-sacrifice of our lives.

THIRD SUNDAY.

Read Heb. viii.

THE SATISFACTION OF OUR DESIRE FOR THE NEW.

"Behold I make all things new."—Rev. xxi. 5.

It has been said that we are creatures of the present, that all our real and available existence is limited to the hour which slips away from us even while we speak—that our inheritance in life is no more than can be supported on this mere pin-point of time called Now—for that the past is no longer ours, and the future is not yet so.

There is a sense in which this is true. If it is meant that the present is the only certain opportunity of life, then it is true that the whole of our varied-hued and multiform life is focussed into this point of vision called Now.

But there is a sense in which it is most untrue to say that our life and existence is rounded off by the present. We are not children of to-day alone; we are children also of yesterday, and we hold relationship with to-morrow. Whatever the fleeting present may be in its immeasurable, practical importance, the powers which link us to the past and to the future are even stronger than all the influences of the present. It is true that we hold life by the single thread of the passing hour, but the thread comes into our grasp throbbing and trembling with the passion music of the past, and runs forward thrilling with desires and hopes into the future. Our present hour is but a peninsula or bleak headland thrust in between two seas, both tumid with waves and lashed into storm by opposing passions and emotions. Hope and her attendant Desire bid us look to the unexplored ocean of futurity; Memory and her handmaid Regret call us to contemplate the past. We are bound to the past by memory and to the future by hope; the one makes us desire the things new, the other makes us regard with double fondness the things old. Thus are we creatures not of the present only, but also of the past and future; and our life's pathway is often the resultant of these two opposing forces—the love of things new and the love of things old. Under the influence of these two powers the world moves on; one party, aglow with hope, cry out for progress; another, touched with reverent fondness, exclaim, "Preserve!" In the young, who feed more on hope, the desire of the things new prevails, not among those who have passed the middle arch of life. Between these two forces stands Religion, holding in either hand her gifts to satisfy both strong instincts; like a good householder bringing forth from her treasure-house the things new to satisfy hope and the things old to satisfy memory, for she knows that no religion would be worthy the name that did not offer some food to these two God-implanted longings—the desire of things new, the love of things old.

My wish is to show that the promise satisfies both these instincts.

The love of things new is satisfied. The book of Revelation is the drama of the world, with its changes, revolutions, and confusions. The chaos into which earth's affairs sometimes falls is reflected here: the sorrows, the solitudes, and the conflicts of the faith are depicted; earth's undertone of sadness echoes here, but the refrain is always of hope, and the closing scene displays the future, with the final overthrow of all that is withered and effete, unholy or untrue. A new city is reared on the strong heavenly heights—new songs rise for the redeemed—new fields environ them—new skies smile down on them, and new powers inspire them. In these—the new city, new heavens, new earth, new songs—we have the promise of the renovation of all forms of life. If ever we have felt that the powers of the old order are gone, we have the promise of a new and durable mechanism and society—a new Jerusalem. If we have ever longed for new prospects, longing for some vantage ground, some lofty view-point whence we could survey wider fields, and look forth upon an ampler horizon, here is the satisfaction of that desire; a new heaven and a new earth is the pledge of new prospects. If ever we have felt that the lapse of time has robbed us of the sources of joy, and like caged birds have found it impossible to sing save in a minor key in this poor tedious world, the promise of new sources of joy is given here, for a new song will rise in that new city.

Here the spirit of Hope finds encouragement. She need not hearken to her sister Despair; the outcome of all the changes and chances of this mortal life is to the brave-hearted and faithful beauty and newness of life. Behold, saith He that sitteth on the throne of the universe and superintends the march of all human life—behold, saith He to all nature waiting with outstretched expectancy for the golden age—behold, saith He to the Bride, the Church, waiting her Bridegroom-Lord—behold, saith He to Hope throbbing with impatience, or to Sadness and Regret looking with mournful eyes over the relics of a troubled and half-used past—behold, God speaks to sorrow, disappointment and doubt, "Behold, I am making all things new."

FOURTH SUNDAY.

Read Rom. vii.

THE NEW FUTURE NOT DESTRUCTIVE OF WHAT IS GOOD IN OUR PAST.

"Behold I make all things new."—Rev. xxi. 5.

But there is another instinct which needs to be satisfied. We are not always eager for the future; while youth is buoyant and life but new, Hope guides us and the desire of things to come is strong; but when the middle arch of life is reached the force of another power is felt. The new things glare where they were wont to please. Memory is fuller, and perhaps hope is emptier. The promise of things new sounds to us like the death-knell of things we love more than all things new; we hunger for the things old; we dread what is novel as we dislike what is strange, and we shrink from being thrust among things new as we shrink from becoming as exiles from the memories and communings with things old.

This instinct, which grows greater as life moves forward (for is not the strength of our longing for the past often in proportion to our distance from it?), the religion of our Master satisfies. He who sits upon the throne is the suffering man whose last thought on His cross was of her whose lips first kissed His infant brow; and He, being human—ay, Divinely so!—knows the strong craving of our hearts for the things old; and while He promises things new, He does not promise things strange or novel; while He promises that the bloom of youth shall be on all He gives us, He still promises that in that world we shall not be as those who are strangers moving among unfamiliar things. Here, for His sake, we may be strangers and pilgrims; there we shall be at home among things all friendly.

This He hints at in the word made use of. There are two words rendered *new*, just as there are two senses in which we use the word *new*. Sometimes we use it of things which are quite novel in character, at other times of things not novel, but fresh. In the New Testament there are two words—one signifying what is fresh and blooming, the other what is merely novel in kind. The new bottles into which the new wine should be put were those which retained their elasticity. The new tomb in which Christ was laid was an unused one. Both, however, were familiar; and so the promise here gives the promise of renovation, of freshness, not of strangeness. And the briefest survey of the imagery of this book shows us that, in harmony with the word here used, the idea of familiarity is not lost.

If we meet with things new, they are never strange in that new world; they keep the marks of what is loved and familiar, even while they are clothed with the bloom of God's nearer presence; the home touches are arrayed in God's promises. Is there a new song? Yet it is no unfamiliar strain, it gathers into itself the chords of past earthly melody, an old melody new set; it is the song of Moses and the Lamb. Is there a new city? Yet is it the perfecting of that city whose fair features and harmonious laws haunted us as the type of all that was beautiful and righteous; familiar as a long-cherished dream below! It is no strange city to which we go—new, but a new Jerusalem. Yea! and though its walls glitter with jewels, and its foundations are radiant with priceless and earth-surpassing gems, yet beneath their dazzling lustre we may see the lines and lights which shone on earth of yore! the heroes of the early and the later faith; the tribes of Israel and the Apostles of the Lamb are its foundations and its gates. There, too, the glad throng are not a stranger folk, who look askance as some new-comer enters the pearly door.

> "And at first, without surprise,
> We shall meet with human eyes."

We see the streets thronged with spirits of just men made perfect, martyrs and saints whose names have been oriflammes of the church below; faces for which we hunger now shall meet us as of old, smiling with the smile of those whom God hath kissed, radiant with new light and new joy, yet familiar; we shall sit down with no unrecognisable company, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of God. Yes, and when we ask for One whom above all others the grateful heart will long to see, we shall behold Him, who loved us and brought us to our loved ones, the Chief among ten thousand, the altogether lovely, the King in His beauty; but a beauty which our redeemed hearts will recognise in the beauty of His suffering and dying love. He will be seen, the Light of the city, the Lamb that had been slain.

Thus does religion, while she gratifies us with the promise of things fresh, and fair, and new, yet pledge herself to be the guardian of all that holy love would fain see preserved. New will be all things, yet only as Earth is new-robed in the spring-time, and still remains our much-loved mother Earth. Thus does He who sits upon the Throne bid us see that in all the changes and confusions of Earth which perplex, nothing that is precious shall be lost; all that is weak and withered shall be made strong and fresh; all that holy love cherishes shall be brought back to us fair and bright as summer morn by Him, who, loving all that seems at strife with faith and love, is even now making all things new. Oh, that while He thus toils, building up out of ruins our new home for us, we may be renewed by that spirit which will enable us to discern its fair and far-shining palaces; that our wills and hearts, renewed by His spirit, and by His discipline in life, may be new creatures here, and meet to wear the new name in His presence who makes all things new.

DISCOVERY OF AN EARLY CHRISTIAN HOUSE AT ROME.

BY REV. S. BARING-GOULD.

From *Chambers's Journal*, London, September, 1890.

A DISCOVERY has been made of a unique description within the walls of ancient Rome, and that is of a house which belonged to Christians of the fourth century, as perfect as any of those that have been exhumed at Pompeii and Herculaneum. The house, with its painted halls, its baths, its cellars, its corridors, owes its preservation to very peculiar circumstances.

In A.D. 361, Julian—commonly known as the Apostate because he renounced Christianity and laboured to revive paganism—was desirous of having about his person and in his palaces only such men as sympathised with him. There were on his accession two chamberlains of the palace in Rome, named John and Paul, who were Christians. As they refused to renounce their religion, Julian sent orders that they should be strangled in their own house, buried in their cellar; and he gave out to the world that they had been banished. The truth, however, came out through their servants; and when a crowd of Christians went to visit their place of burial, soldiers were sent to disperse them and drive them from the house, three of them, two men and a woman, being killed.

Julian reigned but one year and eight months; and his successor, Jovian, a Christian, at once gave orders that a basilica, or church, should be erected over their tomb. This was done by a senator named Pammachius, the friend of Saint Jerome, son of the man to whom the commission was given. Later, in the Lombard invasion, the church was ruined, and was not rebuilt till the twelfth century.

Now it has been discovered that what Pammachius did was to use the old house, laying the floor of his church on the level of the first story, incorporating the walls into his church, and filling up all the ground-floor with earth and stones, so as to assure a solid foundation for his pavement. All he really did in transformation was to knock away the floor above, and knock out one end of the house for the purpose of building an apse. Not only so; but when, in the twelfth century, Nicholas Breakspear, the English pope, rebuilt the church, he used all that remained of the earlier buildings, without altering them or destroying anything. But he had certainly no idea that under the floor was an almost intact ancient Christian mansion, though his builders must have found walls below the surface, which they strengthened, and built upon for their new structure. Unfortunately, side chapels were constructed in the seventeenth century, when the foundations were carried through the disturbed soil to the rock beneath.

The Padre Germano was the first to suspect what lay buried. He observed, on close examination of the south wall of the church, that it exhibited the peculiar appearance of the side of a modern house in a street of Edinburgh or London or Rome, with two rows of windows, one above the other, and a basement of arches. The whole were walled up with Roman bricks; but nevertheless were, when examined, found to constitute unmistakably the side of a house rising at one end to the height of thirty-six feet. In the lower story or basement were six arches. Seventeen feet above appeared the line of a floor, and that is the level of the actual floor of the church. The hill-side slopes rapidly from east to west, so that the level at the portico of the church to the east is seventeen or eighteen feet above the level of the ground at the west end. Above this arcaded basement appeared thirteen windows, all blocked with relieving arches in brick over them; and above these, again, signs of a second floor eleven feet six inches approximately; and then a row of thirteen more windows with their heads knocked off, and the wall of the church rising above and out of these broken windows.

Here, clearly, was the façade of an ancient house, consisting of a ground-floor and two upper stories, and this could only have been the house of the chamberlains, for from the fifth century there is documentary evidence as to the existence of a church on the spot. Moreover, on close inspection it appeared that the house had extended farther to the west by one more bay; but this had been destroyed when the basilica was built, the rugged ends of the wall being left.

The Padre Germano having come to the conclusion that he had found the façade of the house of the martyred chamberlains, next conjectured that the basement story remained fairly intact below the floor of the church. He proceeded to appeal for funds, and began to dig; by the spring of 1889 he had cleared out several vaulted chambers; and after some delay, caused by failure of funds, work has been resumed, and further discoveries will doubtless be made.

He soon proved to have come on the principal rooms of the house, the reception and dining rooms, and these have revealed walls painted richly in a style no way inferior to the best work at Pompeii. The plan of the house is very curious and intricate, and differs a good deal from the ordinary plan of a Roman house, the difference being probably occasioned by the rapid fall of the ground, on the slope of Monte Celio, where the house of the chamberlains stood.

So far, four large chambers have been cleared, as well as two smaller ones—divans, we may call them—and a great deal of that portion of the house devoted to domestic purposes. One noble hall has a frieze of eleven nude figures holding festoons of flowers and fruit, each figure about three feet six inches high, drawn with perfect grace and mastery. Between the figures are peacocks and ducks pacing in easy attitudes, and birds fly above the garlands. The vaulting of this chamber is covered with an intricate pattern of vines trailing in all directions, with children picking grapes and scaring birds. One bird has pounced on a mouse, and is pecking it to death. This chamber belonged almost certainly to the house of the brothers' parents, and the painting to a period before the family embraced Christianity, not that there is any particular heathen symbol in the decoration, or that the early Christians objected to representations of the nude, but that the quality of the drawing is superior to the age of Constantine, and is determined to belong to the third century at the latest.

The Tablinum or grand reception-room of the house, however, leaves no doubt as to the religion of the owners of the house. On the vault is represented Moses removing his shoes before he approaches the burning bush, also a woman with hands uplifted in prayer. In two places in the house are paintings representing a vessel of milk and two sheep, one approaching, the other turning away—a well-known symbolic representation found in the Catacombs, the vessel signifying the "sincere milk of the Word," which some receive and others reject.

The Padre Germano observed that the plaster of the wall, the plaster laid on to receive the painted decorations, was in one place raised in a sort of blister. He picked it, and from under the plaster came forth a leaden seal with the initials of Christ thereon. The Romans were wont to lay leaden seals stamped with the image of the Emperor in the foundations of their buildings. Here the plasterers must have held the leaden seal with the symbol of their Heavenly King with one finger against the wall, whilst they plastered over it, to fix it in place, to show to after-ages that the work had been done by Christians.

Two rooms were void of paintings; all the plaster had been picked off, and there were scratched figures and names on the wall: a ship—"Mayst thou live"—the names of visitors, some in Greek. Padre Germano concluded that this portion of the house must have been left open after the church was built; and that the plaster had been picked off by pilgrims. He conjectured, therefore, that he must be near the place of interment; and before long that was discovered, in the cellar, where was not only the white marble cist or box in which the bodies of the martyrs had been placed, but also a triangular corner table of white marble, standing on a marble pillar, with a hollow sunk like a basin in the top—in fact, the oil-lamp that burnt before their tomb. About this there is to be noted the curious fact that Pope Gregory the Great—the same who sent missionaries to England at the close of the sixth century—sent a present of relics to Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards, and among them was "oil from the confession of Saints John and Paul," that is, oil taken from this identical lamp.

This cellar having been cleared of earth, Padre Germano noticed that the vault above had been rudely cut through, forming a rough hexagonal hole. Moreover, steps were found leading upwards; and these, on being cleared, led to a passage, at the end of which was a window with a grating, exactly over the place of burial of the martyrs. This was the window through which pilgrims let down ribbons to touch the tomb. But what was peculiarly interesting here was a series of paintings, representing on one side the martyrdom, on the other the figures of the martyrs themselves, and others, perhaps Pammachius himself and his wife, bringing baskets of offerings in their hands. As these paintings certainly belong to his time, and as he was a contemporary with the martyrs, it is not impossible that we have in this series actual portraits. That the ancient Romans were very particular about their family portraits we know; and indeed, already one white marble bust belonging to the family series has been found in this buried house.

Among the many objects of interest found besides, we can only notice that two of the wine-jars in the cellar have been found stamped with the Christian symbol; wine was probably contained in them set apart for sacred purposes.

In conclusion, we must point out that this discovery is absolutely unique. Many heathen mansions have been disinterred; but this is the only house that has been found that unmistakably belonged to Christians. In another way it is unique: it is the sole extant sample of a three-storied Roman house. One was uncovered at Pompeii, but the walls fell. Here the walls are intact, built into those of a church.

CHURCH CHOIRS.

BY E. S. TODD, D.D.

From *The Christian Advocate* (M.E.), New York, August 14, 1890.

THE subject is one that will not down. It is almost everywhere, among church members, a frequent subject of conversation, and nearly every church could add a leaf of lively experience on the topic, while some could a tale of woe unfold.

The method of settling the question by having no choir at all is as unsatisfactory as the rest. Allowing that congregational singing is the highest form of church music, yet even this needs the leadership of a trained choir. The professor of music is abroad. Young people receive more or less musical training in the home and school, to say nothing of numerous concerts and public occasions, where music is a prominent feature. On the whole, people are more appreciative of good music, and more keenly alive to the shortcomings of bad, than in the past. To consent at such a time that the church shall have poorer music than that heard at other great gatherings of the people, is to bring to mind an old saying about the children of this world being wiser in their generation than the children of light.

There is, besides, much excellent and appropriate music that the congregation cannot render. The great masters of song devoted their attention largely to the preparation of sacred music of a character that demands a trained choir for its proper expression. Shall the people be driven to the concert hall to hear music which, of right, belongs to the church and church worship? Shall masterpieces of church music, which are, after all, only musical settings to some psalm of David or saying of our Lord, be forever, with the choir, banished from the church, as the most celebrated works of painters and sculptors were once condemned and destroyed by the early Christians?

"But," it is replied, "the choir will not behave itself. The individual members are often not devout, and sometimes not professed Christians at all;" or, to allow a much-exasperated chairman of the Music Committee to state the matter in his own interrogatory way, "Why is it that people who have so much music in their voices have so much meanness in their souls?" The question we would no sooner attempt to answer than assume to deny.

Nevertheless, there are some things to be said in defence of the choir. To begin with, too much is often expected of them. It is required that they shall not only have the gift of song and an appreciation of good music, but, at the same time, shall enter with the same hearty appreciation into the spiritual part of the worship. Instead, it is charged, they are often inattentive when they should listen, and listless when they should pray. That any church would consent to have the immoral or open infidels in the choir is taken for granted.

Desirable as it may seem to have both gifts and grace in the same individual, especially if he have any part in the church service, it is not always possible. It has seemed to be the way of Providence often to use the gifts of men for His cause, even when in grace they were sadly deficient. Many such have greatly blessed the churches. Balaam, according to all accounts, was a very good prophet, but not much of a man. Samson delivered Israel, but was far from being a safe moral guide or example. Miriam doubtless sang well. In music she remains peerless and alone in the thought of every Hebrew. She did not behave any better than some modern singers. She certainly created a first-class disturbance in her brother's home, and no small commotion in the church in the wilderness. Nevertheless, Miriam had her place and work. Perhaps, if we knew all about David's great choir at Jerusalem, consisting of twenty-four great bands of musicians under Asaph, we might find that singers anciently were not perfect, and trouble in church choirs not confined to modern times. David more than once hints at sore trials he was passing through. Perhaps he was having trouble in his choir, which fact, if established, would bring many into closest bonds of sympathy with him. Even though this was the case, which is very probable, yet the fact remains that, partly through this justly celebrated choir, the fame of the worship of Jehovah went out to all nations, and every Israelite would rather be a doorkeeper in the house of the Lord than dwell in the tents of wickedness, and absent envied the sparrows and swallows which could build a nest and so dwell there forever.

Even some wonderful preachers have provoked the remark of one who said of his pastor: "When I hear him in the pulpit I think he never should come out, and when I hear him out I think he never should go in." Yet none could deny that he was mighty in the Scriptures and a master in convincing speech and a great blessing to the churches he served. Still he had glaring defects.

So if the members of the choir are not as devout as we could wish, or as spiritual, or as grave, yet a little forbearance would allow us to utilize such gifts as they have. We make use of the pipe or reed organ solely on account of its musical qualities, though it has not a particle of sense or grace, and the members of the choir have some of both. Neither the organ nor the choir should therefore be set aside. He who condescends to listen to floods and hills and creeping things, who finds perfected praise in the lisping of babes and sucklings, which cannot possibly have any spiritual appreciation of worship; nay, for all we know, take pleasure in an anthem by the choir, even though some hear the voices of the singers only to be reminded of their shortcomings.

Sometimes the fault found with the choir grows out of the oversensitive condition of the preacher. He comes to the service of the Sabbath worn-out with the labor of preparation and nervous. He is in a condition to be easily annoyed at the sexton for doing or not doing, at the late-comers and the non-comers. Any inattention, even trifles that he would not notice at another time, are now positively annoying. The choir is in front, where he can see every motion, or behind, where he can hear every whisper. They are easily and necessarily sinners above others. The question is: How much is due to genuine impropriety on the part of the choir, and how much to undue nervousness on the part of the minister? It is safe at least for a pastor in making up a judgment of the conduct of his choir on a given occasion to make due allowance for his own overstrained condition.

The difficulty is often increased by the treatment the choir receives at the hand of the minister. Is he as respectful while they sing an anthem as he expects them to be while he preaches a sermon? Twice recently visiting ministers were with the writer in the pulpit. On one occasion they carried on a conversation foreign to the service; on another a well-known doctor of divinity spent the time during the anthem in decrying choirs. Yet all the time the choir was rehearsing some old words that even ministers may ponder with profit: "The Lord is in His holy temple; let all the earth keep silence before Him."

The too prevalent practice of criticising the choir is not productive of harmony or spirituality. The laugh often called out by the statement, that the choir sang an anthem which was only repeating over and over the same words, loses its point when we reflect that the words were some gem of thought from the Scriptures. The critic often proves that he needed to hear the same words repeated over some thousands of times, since a moderate number of repetitions failed to impress upon him the force of the quotation. The number of criticisms made upon the choir seem at present to be altogether out of proportion to the number of prayers offered for it. This proportion might be reversed without injury to the choir and to the great profit of the leaders of song.

It is sometimes said that the selections of the choir, other than the ordinary hymns, are in a style of music that few, if any, of the people can appreciate. The charge is just. They are sometimes in the doleful mediæval style and unsuited to the joyful spirit of Protestant worship. This is a criticism that ministers should indulge in sparingly, because one of the most frequent objections to the modern pulpit is that ministers preach over the heads of the people. The idea of sermonizing gained at the seminary, among books, or at some school of oratory, is often and notoriously unsuited to the people.

Noted as some choirs are for lofty flights, can they outfly some ministers, or possibly surpass them in getting beyond and away from the people? In respect to the subject-matter as well the choir often makes the better showing. They generally confine themselves to the Scriptures or approved hymns, which is more than can be said of some preachers.

No choir, as far as we know, has ever been accused of singing about Huxley, Darwin, or the correlation of forces, which is, again, what cannot be asserted of some ministers. The music of the choir is also orthodox, in which also it sometimes differs from the deliverances of the pulpit.

The music in many churches is no doubt lacking in simplicity, spirituality, and earnestness; but ministers can hardly afford to be prominent in pointing out these defects, so long as the same charges lie so generally against their sermons.

Altogether, would it not be well for the minister and the choir to meet together and come to an understanding, in which they should mutually resolve to furnish more simple and nourishing food to the worshippers, and place it within reach of the weakest one of the flock?

Baltimore, Md.

RELIGION VS. THE BIBLE.

From *The Churchman* (Episcopalian), New York, August 30, 1890.

A Western paper, "devoted to the work of conciliating religion with science," publishes a remarkable communication from a gentleman who is engaged in the same effort. A few years ago, he says, he "commenced illustrating 'False and True Universal Science, History, Thought, and Religion' on about 10,000 square feet of oil canvas." This is a large theme, and we should not think ten thousand square feet would hold it all; but perhaps he will procure more canvas as he goes on. At first it was the Bible that he tried to conciliate with science; but he found that this would not do, and "the scientific pressure soon substituted the word religion in place of that of the Bible." This may seem a harmless and even meritorious substitution, as putting the end for the means, the thing contained for the container. But then it is to be remembered that the one term is precise and the other vague. Everybody knows what the Bible is; but "religion" may mean the Christian religion, or the Mohammedan, or the Buddhist, or the religion of Nature—and that last means anything you please. So it looks as if by this change of terms the lecturer, or preacher, or reformer, or evangelist (we would not withhold any title that he may claim) might be removing from a definite to an indefinite position, and possibly from firm ground to bogs and quicksand.

He calls himself "a preacher of progressive views." Now progress is good, when it is not progress backward. But he goes on to say, "My first converting premise was the fact that the Bible does not, nor could not (*sic*), teach anything not taught in surrounding nature, and hence must stand on its own merits as all other books." Here are two different assertions. It "must stand on its own merits" in a sense—yes; that is what you say when you put it in the hands of a person who does not believe in revelation. How else is such a person (not recognizing Church authority) to find out whether there has been a revelation or not? Candidly examined, without prejudice for or against, the Bible will soon differentiate itself from "all other books" and show that it contains matter "of great pith and moment" which is not to be found elsewhere. If it supplies nothing which may not be gathered from geology, chemistry, etc., what is the use of it? Its "merits" have been usually supposed to be just here, that it did teach a great deal "not taught in surrounding nature." But this progressive preacher says it "does not." Why? Because it "could not." Such is "liberal" dogmatism. These "progressive views" are like the progress of the ostrich when it hides its head in the sand. The Bible must stand on its own merits, which are naught: it has nothing in particular to say, so away with it. Surely this doctrine could be illustrated with less than 10,000 square feet of canvas.

But our progressive preacher gives more of his experience. "This conclusion revealed a new world to me and that I had been in gross darkness, but not the grossest; for I have been an original, peculiar Unitarian for years and have not held to the literal interpretation of the Bible." Yet he had held to some interpretation of it, and had believed in its statements, or some of them, after some fashion. One would think this was better than nothing; but he thinks not. Those who hold that the Bible is a Word of God because it testifies to His greater Word, the Saviour of mankind, are in "the grossest darkness." If they would only discard their imbecile superstitions and substitute "religion" for "the Bible," the light would shine in upon them in a great flood, and a new world would be revealed to them. One is reminded of the passage in Isaiah about those who "put darkness for light and light for darkness." The late Abner Kneeland, after he had broken with Christianity, invested all the money he could scrape together in an effort to recover Captain Kidd's treasure, and pinned his faith to somebody who could see where it was hidden by looking into a glass of Hudson river water. The Gospel miracles were to be discarded with contempt, but this method of the diviner and the tumbler was progressive, and rational, and scientific!

There is a little more yet. "My peculiar views," says this reformer, "have long been watched in half-suspicion by my pastorates." One would think so: the strange thing is that the half-suspicion did not rapidly develop into a whole one. It may be a weakness of human nature, but people like to know within a mile or two where their ministers stand, and object to being told that there is nothing whatever left of the old faiths. These sudden revolutions are apt to hurt the feelings of "pastorates," whatever their complexion; even "original, peculiar Unitarians" retain some hold on the recent past and are accustomed to think that the Bible has something to communicate beyond what is "taught in surrounding nature."

Some of them know better now, however; for "I have been very daring in educating my people to a change of some kind that has been making intuitive impressions." Education is good, if it be of the right sort, and it is well to have the courage of one's convictions; but is this all that comes of such "daring" and earnest efforts? "A change of some kind!" We see and feel such changes every week, in the weather, in the markets, in the shop windows, in the political situation—but they are not matters of faith. As for "intuitive impressions," all have them, and those of man's better nature respond to the teachings and example of our Lord, to the noble precepts and prophecies of the Old Testament, to the tenderness and beauty of the New. All have intuitive impressions of a God, of a Christ, of a future state, of a walk of faith that shall lead men thither. And none are ready to give these up till they get in exchange something much better than the apostles of a religion divorced from the Bible can offer.

The late Arthur Hugh Clough, who was an independent thinker of another sort, had some pertinent words to say about the time-spirit and its occasional eccentric demands:

"Thought may well be ever ranging,
And opinion ever changing,"

but down beneath all this there may and must be a permanent principle, a fixed faith. And this faith is not sensational, is independent of sensations, and fancies, and issues, and visions, and new hearsay revelations:

> "Lo, here is God, there is God!
> Believe it not, O man!
> In such vain sort to this and that
> The ancient heathen ran."

His argument, as an "emancipated" man for religious conservatism is worth quoting:

> "Old things need not be therefore true,
> O brother men, nor yet the new;
> Ah, still awhile the old thought retain,
> And yet consider it again!
>
> "The souls of now two thousand years
> Have laid up here their toils and fears,
> And all the earnings of their pain:
> Ah, yet consider it again!
>
> "We! what do we see? each a space
> Of some few yards before his face;
> Does that the whole wide plan explain?
> Ah, yet consider it again!"

We trust the hearers of our wild Western lecturer, and the members of his "pastorates," will consider it a good many times before they yield to the seductions of his ten thousand square feet of oil canvas and of his "change of some kind that has been making intuitive impressions."

CHRISTIANITY FOR SIX MONTHS.

From *The Times*, New York, September 10, 1890.

During the present month in this and other cities and in all the large towns the churches of the different denominations will begin their working season, which usually lasts from October to April or a little longer. The half year devoted to the Summer resorts effectually limits the active life of our parishes to six or eight months, and this fact to-day colors and tones and controls the Christian forces of the country. The country parishes are not quite so limited in their opportunities, but even these find the Winter season the best period for active religious work. The fact that the Christian movement of the year must be put into six months compels the elimination from an active parish of a great deal of religious nonsense.

The severe conditions under which religious work is done to-day are complemented by still more exacting conditions in thought and in life. One of these is the taking off of dogmatic restrictions. The Presbyterians have a creed that their people will not listen to; the dogmatic side of Christianity, in its bones and tissues, is not much tolerated in either Roman or Episcopal churches; the various denominations, like Baptists, Methodists, and the Reformed Church, will not submit to the severe kind of preaching. The stress put upon the preacher everywhere to-day is to impress truth from an ethical point of view on the people at the same time that they are agreeably entertained. The emphasis is not put upon the sin that lies in one's heart and that the Christ came to remove; it is put upon the word "ought" and upon the incentives which should make the "ought" the rule of life. This is found necessary in order to come to people at close range and to reach results by working upon their sympathies. In most places the Christian pulpit has ceased to be the channel of dogmatic, and to some extent even of religious, instruction. People demand the enforcement of ethical truth and the application of spiritual principles to the affairs of daily life. If instruction is to be given, the channels for imparting it are through the book, the newspaper, or the Sunday-school. The pulpit is too important in the work of influencing a congregation in its grasp of the central things of life to spend much time upon the details of instruction. The preacher has six months to do a year's work in, and only half an hour once a Sunday in which to speak effectively to the whole of his congregation.

This is not the whole of the matter. Christianity is only one of the factors which control modern life. It is of the highest importance, but it is not so absolute an element in the life of the people as it was fifty years ago. The minister has his rivals in the newspaper, in the theatre, in the movement of educated life. Much as he may control society, a multitude of activities have slipped the leash of spiritual control and are his rivals in claiming the attention of the people. It requires not less heart, but a great deal more head than it used to for a minister to be a leader in the community and to make his congregation as well as himself felt as a great and strong Christian movement in the community. He counts for less, and he ought to count, in the higher ordering of things, for far more than he once did. With his time so limited for making his impression upon the people, the gifts of administration, the power to put the right person in the right place, the instinct to bring subordinates into line with the work they have to do, the quality of generalship, the ability to look over the community to see what ought to be done, and to arrange the activities for doing it—these qualities are more in demand than they ever were before. They are the prime qualities of an effective ministry, and without them the men in important parishes are likely to stay only long enough for the people to find out their incompetency. In the fields where a year's work is done in six months it is the power of leading and directing others quite as much as the ability to preach effectively that commands the field.

There is still another point to be considered. The work of one parish is much like that of another, though one minister may wear a cassock in his service and the other a frock coat. The present economic tendency is toward co-operation, and the demand of the public in the work of the Churches is for a more comprehensive organization of their activities. As things stand, the ministers and their churches are like so many independent parties pecking away at a quarry without much regard for effective results in their work. The public has a profound conviction of the spiritual wastefulness of the Churches through local interference and bad management. The Churches are judged by their results. Prof. John S. Blackie, in forecasting the Christianity of the future in the August *Forum,* says: "Let the persons who lead the Christian world stamp in their minds firmly these two principles—first, that all extremes are wrong; and again, that all religion, as Cicero says of virtue, consists in action, and we shall see the commencement of the millennium." Prof. Blackie believes that the true wealth of the moral nature of man consists in the consistent manifestation throughout the six working days of the week of what he professes to believe on the day of rest will save the world. The agreement of all Christians in their ethics makes unity of action possible, and the close pressure upon the Churches to-day demands that it shall be practically realized.

CHARLES LORING BRACE, THE CHILDREN'S FRIEND.

BY REV. FREDERICK BURRILL GRAVES.

From *Zion's Herald* (Methodist), Boston, August 3, 1890.

THE death of Charles Loring Brace has removed a great humanitarian, a wise philanthropist, a fine scholar and writer, a wide traveller, a man of the richest Christian character and the broadest Christian benevolence. His place will be hard to fill. His power will long be felt. His life will still speak. With John Howard and the Earl of Shaftesbury he must be classed in undying honor.

He was born in Litchfield, Conn., in 1826, was graduated from Yale College, and there and at the Union Theological Seminary studied theology, preparing himself for the ministry. This fact, together with his sweet, helpful nature, made all his future charitable labors, in a singular sense, Christian. The very first words of one of his many books were these: "The central figure of the world's charity is Christ." And this may be called the spirit which permeated all his endeavor. Mr. Brace's father, John Pierce Brace, was a distinguished man, of considerable prominence as an educator and editor, being probably one of the most versatile scholars of his day in New England. He devoted himself chiefly to the welfare and interests of American women, as his son after him gave his life largely to the saving of children from vice and crime. While in his educational work at Litchfield and Hartford, and as editor of the Hartford *Courant,* he had under his tutelage many young women who afterwards became prominent. Mrs. Stowe was among the number, and "Uncle Tom's Cabin" grew, a radiant flower, out of the soil that the elder Brace had ploughed, harrowed, sown, and cultivated. The

SAME IMPATIENCE OF WRONG AND SUFFERING WAS IN THE FATHER AS IN THE SON,

and the same wise, practical sense which can devise remedies for their overthrow. "Charity never *faileth.*"

At the close of his college and theological course, the son took a journey afoot, with Frederick Law Olmstead, through Great Britain and Ireland. The young minister kept his eyes open to the condition of the masses, and the means used for its improvement. He saw with a clear eye. He heard with a quick ear. He felt with a warm heart. He pondered with a wise head. In 1851, from the great German capital, where he had spent the winter in study, he penetrated into the interior of Hungary—the first American who had been there. While at Grosswardein, he was arrested by the Austrian authorities on suspicion of being a secret agent of the Hungarian revolutionists in America, and thrown hurriedly into prison, without inquiry or trial. He was to have been tried by court-martial—a most summary proceeding, which would have resulted seriously for the Austrian Government, if the full programme had been carried out. Diplomatic correspondence, after much bitter dispute, succeeded in effecting his release. In the old castle of the walled

Hungarian city where he was imprisoned, he doubtless felt by experience a sense of the great wrongs the *proletaire* and *canaille* suffer from tyranny, and formed the determination to do what he could for them in his own native land. For it was the very next year—1852—that he associated himself with Rev. Mr. Pease in work among the poorest classes at Five Points and Blackwell's Island. Tyranny! where is it? Only on the throne? No; it is in every vice and sin, every crime and wrong, every lust and license. The tyranny at Vienna was not the same as that at Five Points, but each had its suffering slaves. And so, therefore, Charles Loring Brace was no less a necessity, and no less a hero, than Louis Kossuth.

But Mr. Brace soon saw that his labors must include especially the children of the poor, if the work was to be thorough, more hopeful and permanent. Hitherto the labor had been spent on those who were not so susceptible to the influences he brought to bear as children would be. Before a year had passed he established, with others,

THE CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY,

as wise and beneficent a charity as ever was devised. The trustees of this society were Christian men of known probity, character, and energy, and all their sympathies were in the work. Over $1,000,000 have flowed through its treasury, without the loss of a dollar; and during one year—1870, I believe—$80,000 was given to the society by private individuals, thus showing the deep interest of the public in its work. Mr. Brace always made it a rule to keep the society open to the inspection of the people. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that not a dollar was distributed unwisely, to the undeserving.

It was one of the delightful features of Mr. Brace's work that he always seemed anxious to benefit the children. For them all he had a kind word and a sympathetic prayer. Being a devout Christian himself, he wished every child might say:—

> "I thank the goodness and the grace
> Which on my birth have smiled,
> And made me in these Christian days
> A happy Christian child."

And his ideal reached even as far as this into the bright, Christian day that is to be. But what a task! He could do only a little, but that would help on towards that future day. Oh! there was enough for him to do, and for others still. Bootblacks, pedlers, "canawl-boys," newsboys, waifs, foundlings, beggars, flower-sellers, pick-pockets, thieves, dock pilferers—these are the children to be taken, trained, saved from "Rotten Row" and "Poverty Lane."

About a year after the formation of the Children's Aid Society, Mr. Brace founded

THE FIRST NEWSBOYS' LODGING-HOUSE

in the United States. For a great many of these boys he secured homes in the West, where, abandoning all their former environments and influences, they could grow up to a respectable and useful manhood. I have no doubt that some of the richest solace for Mr. Brace's lonely and sorrowful hours came from the memories of these newsboys, and their grateful letters to him. I have extracted from Mr. Brace's journal a speech made by one of them, just before departing for the West:—

> "Boys, gintlemen, chummies: P'raps you'd like to hear summit about the West, the great West, you know, where so many of our old friends are settled down and growin' up to be great men, maybe the greatest men in the great Republic. Boys, that's the place for growin' Congressmen, and Governors, and Presidents. Do you want to be newsboys always, and shoe-blacks, and timber-merchants in a small way by sellin' matches? If ye do, you'll stay in New York, but if you don't, you'll go out West and begin to be farmers, for the beginning of a farmer, my boys, is the making of a Congressman and a President. Do you want to be rowdies, and loafers, and shoulder-hitters? If ye do, why, ye can keep around these diggin's. Do you want to be gentlemen and independent citizens? You do—then make tracks for the West, from the Children's Aid Society. If you want to be snoozers, and rummies, and policy-players, and Peter Funks men, why you'll hang up your caps and stay around the groceries, and jine the fire-engine and target companies, and go firin' at hay-stacks for bad quarters; but if ye want to be the man who will make his mark in the country, ye will get up steam, and go ahead, and there's lots on the prairies a-waitin' for yez. . . . But how will it be if you don't go, boys? Why, I'm afeared when you grow too big to live in the lodging-house any longer, you'll be like
>
> THE LOST SHEEP
>
> in the wilderness, as we heard of last Sunday night here, and you'll maybe not find your way out any more."

Mr. Brace and his coadjutors were sometimes opposed by the Romish priests, who, he thought, had largely lost the love for the poor of their own communion which characterized priests of earlier generations in other lands. The Romish priesthood are especially tenacious of their children, and there is where the friction occurred. Mr. Brace's work was purely unsectarian, and he had only charity for the Romish priesthood save when it attempted by intrigue to destroy what is distinctively American—

like our public schools. In regard to this he says:—

> "Under no circumstances should the Protestants of the nation allow the free schools to be broken up. They are the foundation of the Republic and the bulwark of Protestanism and civilization. They undermine the power of the priests, which rests on ignorance, while they leave untouched whatever spiritual force the Roman Catholic Church may truly have and deserve to have."

Mr. Brace would not receive or train in his schools those who could possibly be in the public school. I will quote from Mr. Brace's book—"The Dangerous Classes of New York"—the causes of crime, as he enumerates them: (1) Ignorance; (2) orphanage; (3) emigration; (4) want of trade; (5) weakness of marriage-tie; (6) inheritance; (7) overcrowding; (8) intemperance.

And yet, notwithstanding these eight giants of evil, Mr. Brace was hopeful. The stone in his sling was charity. He hurled it with unerring swiftness to their foreheads, and though they fell not, they reeled. This David has been taken, and the war must still be waged.

CALVINISM AND THE BIBLE.

BY REV. PROF. W. G. T. SHEDD, D.D.

From *The New York Observer*, September 11, 1890.

THE question, What is the system of doctrine contained in the Westminster Confession, and what is essential to its integrity? is more important than ever, now that the Presbyteries have voted in favor of revision, and the General Assembly has instructed its committee "not to propose any alterations or amendments that will in any way impair the integrity of the Reformed or Calvinistic system of doctrine taught in the Confession of Faith." The vote of the Church in answer to the overture of the fifteen Presbyteries shows that sixty-eight Presbyteries desire no revision at all of their Standards, and that ninety-two desire no revision that would alter the doctrinal system contained in them. This vote evinces that at least three-fourths of the Northern Presbyterian Church wish to be known as a Calvinistic denomination, in distinction from a Broad Church, tolerating all varieties of "evangelical" belief; and the general tenor of the discussion in the late Assembly was strongly against the dis-Calvinizing of the Confession.

Some advocates of revision object to this decision of the Assembly to make Calvinism a test of revision, and demand that Scripture be the test. Of course Scripture is the only infallible rule of faith. But this particular way of appealing to Scripture is specious and fallacious. In the first place, it assumes that Calvinism is not Scriptural, an assumption which the Presbyterian Church has never granted. This Church does not accept the alternative—the Bible or Calvinism—presented in this appeal. Its watchword is, The Bible and Calvinism. Secondly, this kind of appeal to Scripture is only an appeal to Scripture as the reviser understands it. "Scripture" properly means the interpretation of Scripture; that is, the contents of Scripture as reached by human investigation and exegesis. Creeds, like commentaries, are Scripture studied and explained, and not the mere abstract and unexplained book as it lies on the counter of the Bible House. The infallible Word of God is expounded by the fallible mind of man, and hence the variety of expositions embodied in the denominational creeds. But every interpreter claims to have understood the Scriptures correctly, and, consequently, claims that his creed is Scriptural, and if so, that it is the infallible truth of God. The Arminian appeals to the Articles of Wesley as the rule of faith, because he believes them to be the true explanation of the inspired Bible. For him they are the Bible in a nutshell. The Calvinist appeals to the creeds of Heidelberg, Dort and Westminster as the rule of faith, because he regards them as the accurate exegesis of the revealed Word of God. By the "Bible" these parties, as well as all others who appeal to the Bible, mean their understanding of the Bible. There is no such thing as that abstract Scripture to which the revisionist of whom we are speaking appeals; that is, Scripture apart from any and all interpretation of it. When, therefore, the advocate of revision demands that the Westminster Confession be "conformed to Scripture," he means conformation to Scripture as he and those like him read and explain it. It is impossible to make abstract Scripture the rule of faith for either an individual or a denomination. No Christian body has ever subscribed to the Bible merely as a printed book. A person who should write his name on the blank leaf of the Bible and say that his doctrinal belief was between the covers, would convey no definite information as to his creed. He might be a Socinian, or a Calvinist, or anywhere between these extremes. The only question, consequently, before the Presbyterian Church is, Whether the Confession shall be kept conformed to Scripture as the Calvinist understands it, or as the non-Calvinist or anti-Calvinist understands it; whether it shall continue to present that interpretation of Scripture which goes under the names of Augustine and Calvin, of Heidelberg, Dort and Westminster, or that which under some other name, say that of "modern exegesis," or of "progressive theology." The Presbyterian Church has decided in favor of the first proposition. The question, What is Calvinism? is mainly one of reasoning and discrimination. It relates to a matter of fact. This question will answer itself in the discussion now going on; for this theological system possesses as distinctive features as the Copernican astronomy, and it will be as impossible to confuse and unsettle the religious world respecting the former, as it would be to confuse and unsettle the scientific world respecting the latter. The essential parts of this system are the well-known five points of Calvinism, namely, total depravity in distinction from partial; unconditional election in distinction from conditional; irresistible regenerating grace in distinction from resistible; limited redemption (not atonement) in distinction from universal; the certain perseverance of the regenerate in distinction from their possible apostasy. No one of these points can be rejected without impairing the integrity of Calvinism, any more than one of the points of the mariners' compass can be omitted and the scheme be complete, any more than one of the contrary five points of Arminianism can be deleted and the theory remain unaltered.

The "Institutes" of Calvin, after all the development of the Reformed or Calvinistic type of doctrine by later theologians, still remain one of the best statements of this powerful system. The keen and aquiline eye of the most scientific theologian of the Reformation saw the fundamental truths of revelation with an accuracy and precision that required no correction on his part. The great work of his early manhood remained unchanged by him to the end of his career, and since his day it has laid at the foundation of all subsequent theologizing of this class, as the *Principia* of Newton has under all the succeeding mathematics of Europe. While, however, a revision of the Westminster Standards that shall be true to their structure and system does not require that the peculiarities of individual Calvinists, even of Calvin himself, or of Calvinistic schools should be followed, it does require that all of those constituent and formative tenets by which Augustinianism differs from Semi-Pelagianism and Calvinism from Arminianism, shall be reaffirmed and maintained. The revision must be conformed to the historical Calvinism as stated in the principal Reformed or Calvinistic creeds, and not to Calvinism as constructed by any particular theologian, however able or popular in his own day and denomination.

The Christian religion contains certain truths that are so indisputably taught in the Christian Scriptures, that their acceptance is necessary in order to be a Christian in the sense in which the first disciples were so called at Antioch. They are the doctrines of the trinity and incarnation, of apostasy and redemption, as they are generally and largely enunciated in the Apostles' and Nicene creeds. Respecting these, there has been little disagreement in ancient, mediæval, and modern Christendom. The Christian religion also contains other truths which, both in the Scripture and in the doctrinal systems constructed out of them, are implications and deductions from these cardinal doctrines. It is in reference to this class of more strict and precise tenets, that evangelical Christendom has from the first been divided into two great divisions. In respect to them, the ancient theologian was either Augustinian or Semi-Pelagian; the modern theologian is either Calvinistic or Arminian. The difference between them relates principally to the more exact definition of original sin, of human freedom and ability, and of the Divine sovereignty and decrees. So long as Christian believers see through a glass darkly, there will be a speculative difference between them on these abstruser parts of revelation that will affect more or less the style of the religious experience, and make separate religious organizations desirable. This difference has for fifteen centuries crystallized into two sharply-edged types of theology, and there are no signs that one will outreason and conquer the other. Calvinism and Calvinistic denominations will probably continue to exist to the end of time; and so will Arminianism and Arminian denominations. In the future, as in the past, all evangelical believers will belong either to one dogmatic division or the other. It is better, in these circumstances, that both shall live and work side by side in frank and respectful recognition of each other, than to destroy the self-consistence of each by an attempt to combine both in a single system. Only these two general schemes of Christian doctrine are logically possible; for schemes that deny the trinity and incarnation, the apostasy and redemption, are Deistic, not Christian. Both scientific theology and dogmatic history evince that there is no *tertium quid* between Calvinism and Arminianism, and that the choice of an individual or a denomination, consequently, lies between one or the other. Semi-Pelagianism was a real mid-point between the tenets of Augustine and those of Pelagius; but there is no true intermediate between the system of Calvin and that of Arminius. In the history of doctrine there are sometimes semi-quavers but demi-semi-quavers never.

Such being the facts, it is of the utmost importance to the Presbyterian Church that it retain the historical Calvinism upon which it was founded, and by which it has prospered. But it is of even greater importance to the whole world. It is a common remark of historians and philosophers, that Calvinism lays very deep the foundations of religious belief, of moral order, of civil society, and general intelligence and virtue, and that forms of government and social institutions which rest upon it are invincible and "cannot but by annihilating die." Should this type of doctrine and this form of the religious experience disappear, Christendom would lose its balance-wheel. For it is no disparagement of the energy of evangelical Protestanism of all varieties, in the defence of the common faith, and the war upon the common unbelief, to say that the Genevan theology is always in the front whenever a fearless position has to be taken in behalf of an unpopular but revealed truth, whenever the Christian herald must announce the solemn alternatives of salvation and perdition to a sensuous, a pleasure-loving, and an irritable generation; whenever, in short, the stern and severe work of the perpetual campaign on earth against moral evil has to be done. The best interests of the Christian religion and Church require the continual existence and influence of that comprehensive and self-consistent creed which Augustine formulated out of Scripture, and Calvin reaffirmed and re-enforced. Evangelical Arminians who do not adopt it feel its influence, praying it in their prayers and singing it in their hymns; and Rationalists of all grades while recoiling from it acknowledge its massiveness and strength. It may, therefore, be confidently expected that whatever be the fortunes of a particular Church, or the tendencies of a particular time, this form of doctrine will perpetually survive in Christendom like the Scriptures themselves out of which it was derived.

RANK IN HEAVEN.

BY REV. DR. EDWARD JUDSON.

From *The Illustrated Christian Weekly*, New York, September 13, 1890.

ONCE upon a time a man strayed into a Christian church, who belonged to a class sometimes called *toughs*. He had a face as hard as the nether millstone, and a heart to match. He bore upon his person scars made by the knife in street brawls. He had been an inmate of many prisons. But under the influence of the Gospel this unpromising character became a Christian, and undertook the duties of a new life. This was in no wise easy for him, because his wife was a bigoted, drunken creature, who made it the persistent aim of her existence to thwart all his noble endeavors. She used to keep him from church, provoke him to anger, and in fact did her very best to draw him back into his old courses.

For fifteen months, however, he persisted firmly in Christian behavior. At the end of this time, under peculiar stress of temptation, he fell back into his old ways, but at once recovered himself, and, expressing deepest regret for his waywardness, resumed the obligation of religion. After another period of consistent conduct he succumbed to his malign environment, and, in the delirium of a fever, shot himself. Now one would say, looking at such a life superficially, that it had very little to show of substantial Christian service and sacrifice. But perhaps He who looks not on the outward appearance, and who measures the force of effort, as well as the bulk of attainment, may rank even the miserable New York tough among the *last that shall be first.*

"Not on the vulgar mass
Called "work" must sentence pass,
Things done, that took the eye and had the price;
O'er which, from level stand,
The low world laid its hand,
Found straightway to its mind, could value in a trice.

"But all, the world's coarse thumb
And finger failed to plumb,
So passed in making up the main account:
All instincts immature,
All purposes unsure,
That weighed not as his work, yet swelled the man's amount.

"Thoughts hardly to be packed
Into a narrow act,
Fancies that broke through language and escaped;
All I could never be,
All men ignored in me,
This I was worth to God, whose wheel the pitcher shaped."

Doubtless celestial mensuration will often reverse earthly estimate. The soul's value will be determined, not by the bulk of the work done and the sacrifice rendered, but by the animating spirit of the life. This was exactly the lesson our Lord taught Peter in His parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard. Peter had asked Him the characteristic question : *Lord, we have forsaken all and followed thee ; what shall we have therefore?*

One is shocked at such a claim made by a follower of Christ,—it betrays such self-consciousness and such a mercenary spirit. We should expect Christ to administer to Peter a rebuke, sudden and sharp. But He does nothing of the sort. Like the surgeon who folded his lancet in a sponge, it was Christ's way before a reprimand to prepare and soften the heart with a gentle word of comfort and promise. And so He begins by assuring Peter that those who make sacrifices in His name shall be amply rewarded in this life and the next. Then He adds the word of warning : *But many that are first shall be last ; and the last shall be first.* In other words, what is done and suffered all goes for nothing, if there is the wrong spirit. The moths of self-consciousness and self-seeking fret into dust the most gorgeous tapestry of Christian service and sacrifice. Those that are counted first here, because of what they have done and suffered for the good cause, shall be rated last over yonder, because all was spoiled by a proud and selfish spirit ; while on the other hand, many who are regarded as least and hindmost here, of whom people said : What have they done or endured for the Master ? shall rank first in Heaven, because their lives were pervaded by the aroma of a meek and quiet spirit.

He then illustrates His point by telling a story about some working men, who although they had been hired at five o'clock in the afternoon and had worked only one hour, and so might be called *the last,* yet in the estimation of their employer, took precedence of others who had worked hard all day long, but with a mercenary spirit, like Peter's, who said : *What shall we have therefore?* and with a proud consciousness that they were *first,* since they said : *We have borne the burden and heat of the day* —the very echo of Peter's words : *We have forsaken all and followed thee.* All well enough in the world of trade, but all wrong in the spiritual life.

The Christian life, then, will be valued not by its mass, but by its motive. The poor widow depositing her two mites in the Lord's treasury, though last here, shall be first there. The humble servant performing faithfully her household duties, with the simple purpose of pleasing God, though last here shall be first there. The obscure sufferer in a tenement house bearing patiently the ills of life, rated last and least among the children of men, may be first and foremost in Heaven. The Christian life consists not in doing some great thing, but in being right with God.

Rank in the kingdom of Heaven will be determined not by the amount of work done or suffering borne, but by the spirit and motive of the life. A self-seeking spirit spoils the fairest endeavor. "Pursue virtue virtuously," says Sir Thomas Browne. "Leaven not good acts with fond intentions, nor circumstantially deprave substantial goodness." The great tenor, Mario, was one morning passing through the market-place at Lyons, when his attention was attracted by a poor beggar woman and her child, who were appealing for help. Impressed by the noble face of the child he felt in his pocket for money, but found it was empty. Baring his head and holding his hat in such a way as to screen his face and to receive the coins of the passers by, he began to sing a simple air. The song ended, he poured the gathered treasure into the lap of the grateful mother, and went his way not dreaming that he had been recognized. But in the evening when he appeared before the footlights cheer after cheer arose from the assembled throng that pelted him with flowers, and would not be satisfied until he had repeated in the theatre the song of the market-place. How the hope of reward would have spoiled the fine action ! How bright in the light of Heaven, shines

> "That best portion of a good man's life,
> His little nameless, unremembered acts of kindness and of love."

The brightest Christian virtue, moreover, is devoid of self-consciousness as well as of self-seeking. Piety, like beauty, is undone as soon as it is conscious of itself. The best men and women in our churches are those that don't know it. They mourn over their imperfections, rather than claim to have reached some higher plane of goodness. In passing through the great fields of Indian corn in some Western State, one observes that the ears which are small and green and not filled out, stand perfectly erect upon the stalk, while the ears that are ripe and brown and weighed down with golden grain, bend over, so that the husk forms an umbrella, completely protecting the fruit. The best people are like that. Laden with the fruits of Christian experience, they bend low with humility and a sense of imperfection. As bees fly home to their hives, their thighs laden with pollen, which they shake off, and never looking behind fly away again for another load, leaving it for others to pack the pollen away in the cells, so the true Christian forgets those things which are behind and reaches forth unto those things which are before. It is a good motto, to do all the good you can to all the people you can, and make as little fuss about it as you can. Every noble life is haunted by the same divine discontent that is voiced in the lines written by Helen Hunt Jackson, only four days before her death :

" Father, I scarcely dare to pray,
So clear I see, now it is done,
That I have wasted half my day,
And left my work but just begun.

" So clear I see that things I thought
Were right or harmless were a sin ;
So clear I see that I have sought
Unconscious, selfish aims to win.

" So clear I see that I have hurt
The souls I might have helped to save,
That I have slothful been, inert,
Deaf to the calls Thy leaders gave.

" In outskirts of Thy kingdoms vast,
Father, the humblest spot give me ;
Set me the lowliest task Thou hast,
Let me, repentant, work for Thee."

LIBERTY AND OPPRESSION.

From *The Christian Intelligencer* (Reformed Dutch), New York, August 3, 1890.

In these days, when so large a number of men of little education and experience, and of very limited pecuniary responsibility, are in office, and when elections are frequently decided by the lower classes, as they are called, of the cities, and when the tendency is toward an increase of political power in those classes by their increase in numbers, it is said that acts of oppression do not originate with the common people, the laboring classes, but with the rich and the higher classes. Such is the opinion often heard, expressed in the words of the off-hand every-day talk of men. When fears are uttered that the growing power of the masses may lead to limitations of the liberty of the people and to an arrogant and oppressive use of official positions, it is said that such action does not proceed from the masses, that they are on the side of the largest liberty and the utmost equality among men. We are told that free institutions are in peril from the designs of the rich, the disposition of the plutocrats, as it is the fashion to call them. It is said that the chief danger lies in the use of money in elections, in buying local and State legislatures, in bribing executive officers, and in controlling the newspapers. It is asserted that this is also the teaching of history. It is also said that the welfare of society at large is threatened by employers rather than by the employed. Wealthy manufacturing corporations, and railways, and companies of various kinds, are regarded with suspicion as tending to oppression of the people, who are the majority, and as disposed to reduce elections to a farce by the use of money, and to control the legislatures by their incorporated wealth.

But there are reasons for hesitation in accepting such an opinion. It is not clear that it is sustained by history. Nearly seven hundred years ago—it was on June 15, 1215—King John of England was compelled to sign Magna Charta by, not the common people, but the barons. That instrument has been regarded as the basis of English liberties, out of which have come American liberties. That great Charter, among many other declarations of rights which awaken wonder that any body of men at that time should have embodied them in national law, contains such words as these : " No freeman shall be taken or imprisoned, or be disseised of his freehold, or liberties, or free customs, or be otherwise damaged, nor will we pass upon him, nor send upon him, but by lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land." A noble declaration. And provision was made for securing the independence of the courts. This was the work of the nobility of England. They did indeed secure their own rights and possessions from the encroachments of the crown, but they obtained no less a declaration of the rights of the freemen. And the course of English legislation since that period has been to enlarge the number of freemen, and that legislation has originated with men who did not belong to the common people, but who represented the educated, the wealthy, the aristocratic circles of the country.

The guilds, and train bands, and various organized bodies in the free cities, or of cities which had received special charters, had an important part on the Continent and in Great Britain, in destroying the feudal system and in advancing the popular movement toward free, representative, constitutional government. Their fighting force consisted of apprentices and artisans, but it was directed and maintained by men who had gained wealth from manufactures and trade and commerce. The motive force resided in what we now speak of as a syndicate or corporation.

The Declaration of Independence by the United States was written by the owner of a large property in land. The body which adopted and signed it consisted of owners of extensive estates, professional men, men of education, in fact, of the aristocracy of the country, so far as there was an aristocracy. The Constitution of the United States, the most remarkable political document ever produced by uninspired men, originated with the same class of citizens which had signed the Declaration. It was the higher classes of Americans which framed these famous state papers. Constitutional liberty has been framed and established by men of wealth and education and high social position. They have surrendered personal distinction and class privileges, and made them common property, and conferred equal rights upon all citizens.

It is wise, also, to consider that in the United States there are to-day two despotisms, each maintained by the common people, as they are called. One is the papistical hierarchy, the other the labor union. Both are despotic oligarchies. The Roman Church is ruled by the hierarchy, and the hierarchy, as recent incidents have made perfectly plain, is held in unconditional obedience to the ecclesiastical superiors. The membership of the Roman Church has no representation, no voice, in its government. This organization receives its chief support from the common people. The labor union is far from being a voluntary association, and is bound to unquestioning obedience to its leaders. Men are compelled to enter the union, are annoyed, worried, often almost persecuted, until for peace sake and that they may earn a living, they enter the organization and bind themselves with an oath to obey its officers. If the workingmen of the Northern States were perfectly free to join the unions or not; if remaining their own masters, free to work for whom they prefer, as many hours as they please, for such wages as they are willing to accept, they would be free from persistent annoyance and abuse, in one week the most skilful, intelligent, thrifty and conscientious workingmen of these States would withdraw from the unions. In framing a government for themselves, the workingmen have not formed a free government, but have set up a despotic oligarchy. The proof is abundant, and has been most offensively thrust upon the people of the land during the past fortnight. The strike which has threatened the people of many States during the past two weeks could not have been originated and could not be maintained if the members of the union engaged in it were free men.

Is it true, also, as men say, that men of wealth buy the votes of legislators and bribe the executive officers of cities and States? Is it true that rich men and corporations corrupt the rulers and assail the public virtue on which free institutions rest? Some men of experience who do not talk on the platform or write for the journals or reviews, hold a contrary opinion. Their occupation has frequently required legislation to secure an open field or to release it from unjust burdens, and they declare that they have found it necessary to pay legislators and executive officers in order to secure any action whatever. The law establishing the paid Fire Department of this city was carried through the State legislature by gifts of money to legislators and official personages, the money being contributed by the insurance companies. Such a department was necessary, the public safety and welfare demanded it; good citizens called for it. Action, however, could not be secured from the legislature until the companies had paid for it. An assessment was laid on certain property for a public improvement by a bill of the legislature. There was a flaw in the statute, and neither the County Treasurer nor the State Treasurer would receive the assessment, which the owners of the property wished to pay. A bill was prepared removing this impediment. Interest was accumulating, and from the burden upon it the property was unsalable. The representative of the twenty or more owners of the property carried the bill to enable them to pay their assessment, to the legislature, expecting that that body would adopt it without delay. He was unable to obtain any action beyond the introduction of his bill, although the members whose favor he sought all acknowledged the justice and necessity of the statute. It was necessary to pay ten thousand dollars to the legislators and to executive officers, to secure the passage of a bill to enable men to pay an assessment. Such instances could easily be multiplied. Executive officers demand fees for the performance of the duties of their positions, duties belonging to their office for which they receive salaries. Every man knows this who has business to transact with the departments of our city and State governments. And these officers are elected by the masses. The rich men and the property owners and corporations would be thankful to be delivered from the necessity of paying fees and buying the votes of legislative bodies. They are not corrupting the officers of the government; on the contrary, these officials will not act until they are paid to do so. There are exceptions to these statements. There are men in office who are not there for the money they can make out of it; but the number is large who will do nothing until they receive a fee, often so large that it can prevent action. Those who accuse the plutocracy of corrupting the officers of the government, if they stood a year or two in the so-called plutocrat's shoes would experience a great change in their opinions. And we repeat that these officials demanding fees have been elected by the masses, the plain people, the common people, who form the majority of the voting population.

The citadel of freedom in the world is the Protestant Christian Church, the Church of the Reformation. It is the most perfect example of a free, representative, constitutional government. It is an absolutely voluntary organization. It maintains that the rich and poor stand on an equality before God, the maker of all. It teaches and believes that one is our Master, even Christ, and we all are brethren. It upholds in the world the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man. Its Magna Charta is the Bible, the poor man's book as well as the rich man's book. It is the opponent of wrong of every kind, and the chief advocate of right. It lifts up the degraded and oppressed, and rebukes whoever degrades or oppresses. True, abiding Christian faith is the liberator of the world. It teaches and induces men to accept and practise a Godlike, Christlike righteousness, and a generosity and compassion and love which have never been equalled in human history. If all men were Christians, believing and obeying the Word of God, all men would be free indeed.

UNCONSCIOUS CREED REVISION.

BY THE REV. NEWMAN SMYTH, D.D.

From *The Christian Union*, New York, August 11, 1890.

It has often been said that the great creeds of the Church were born rather than made. They were not so much products of theological workshops as issues of the Christian life and thought of an age. Hence we are naturally suspicious of new-made creeds, and somewhat reluctant to adopt a confession which bears on it the marks of the hands by which it has been manufactured. We remember how long that simplest and œcumenical creed, the Apostles', was in growing. The new creed which seems to be predestined for the Presbyterian Church, in the good purpose of God, will surely come to pass in its day; but when it is formed, it will be found not to comprehend merely the results of different theological endeavors, but to bring rather to some simpler and clearer expression the truth of the Spirit which has been quietly and vitally working in that Church since the Westminster Assembly adjourned. Because we believe in the Holy Ghost, we must expect to see new creeds in their season among the fruits of the Spirit. But it often takes long years for a creed to ripen on the tree of life.

The law of creed revision seems to be something like this: first some new and true development of the life of the Church in response to its providential environment, by which the type of Christian character is gradually modified and fitted to new and better conditions of existence, and then a reflection of this advancement of the Christian life in the traditional forms of belief. The credal forms adjust themselves slowly but surely to the vital changes in the Christian type of character.

This process and law of creed revision seems to be illustrated in an interesting way in the successive forms of covenant which have been used by the historic First Church of New Haven. They reflect, with what may be regarded an unconscious truthfulness, the changes which have taken place during two hundred and fifty years in the general character and spirit of Christian people. In one particular this reflection of prevalent conceptions of Christian life in the successive church covenants is so striking and interesting that it seems to me worthy of notice.

The founders of the church were Calvinists in their theology and in their view of life. Their covenant—the earliest one of which we have any record, and which was used by John Davenport, who was the first pastor of the church—contains, among other promises, these words: "You do give yourself up unto the Lord Jesus Christ to be taught and governed by him in all your relations, conditions, and conversations in this world, avouching him to be . . . your only king and lawgiver."

The idea of life as given up to Christ, the lawgiver and king, thus distinctly appears in this early Christian covenant. And the records of the discipline of the church show with what conscientious minuteness this Calvinistic conception and covenant of life was carried out.

Some fifty or more years later another form of covenant seems to have come into use in this church, and in that we find the idea of God's sovereignty and man's entire submission emphasized, and made even more commanding. The believer's promise, according to this second covenant, was as follows: "You do now give up yourself, soul and body, and all that you have, are, or shall be, unto God, through Jesus Christ, to be his forever, and at his sovereign disposal in all things." Then follow substantially the words already quoted from the former covenant. The type of Christian character had not changed in New England, unless, possibly, some of its lines had become harder or more pronounced. The sovereignty of God still was dominant as the supreme truth in the Christian conception of God. And the church covenant is true to the controlling idea of life, that man is the subject of Almighty God, whose decree is absolute, and whose holy will is to be done on earth at any cost.

One hundred years later, in 1791, another covenant was adopted by the church. The Puritan type of character had then become loosened, and the immediate change was not altogether for the best. Many divines looked upon that period as a time when the faith of the Church was declining, and even the promises of God to the fathers seemed to be no longer like a full tide coming in with uplifting power, but to be ebbing fast away from these shores. The old divinity had lost vital power, and the new divinity of Moses Stuart and Dr. Taylor had not yet come flowing in. And with singular truthfulness the covenant of the church reflects the general religious conditions of the age. The Christian promise reduces itself to a vow of self-dedication to God and the endeavor "to walk worthy the Christian vocation." The strong, responsible Calvinism is taken out of the covenant, and the new conception of the Christian life, which we shall find later, has not entered in. The covenant is thus left without the strength of the old age or the power of the new age to come. Naturally, it was not kept in use many years.

In 1809 still another creed and covenant were adopted, enlarged in the article of belief, but without change in the promises. Meanwhile the missionary age had begun. The Church was awakening to its obligations to those beyond its covenanted mercies. The conception of life was expanding. The believer, it was coming to be felt, is called and chosen, not simply to be saved, but also to be a servant of Christ. The dawn of the missionary century brought to men some revelation of this old truth of Israel which we are now coming fully to own, that election is for service. "Behold my servant whom I uphold; mine elect."

Now it is interesting to see how this change in the Christian idea of life and type of character finds expression in the covenant of the church. It is stated in our records that in 1831 (during the earlier years of Dr. Bacon's ministry) the ancient covenant was adopted, "with a few verbal alterations." But in these few verbal alterations, which seem to have been introduced almost as a matter of course, and adopted without discussion, lie the significance of the change, and the unconscious witness of the covenant to the great advance in the conception of the Christian life to which the Spirit was leading all our churches. The promise now reads: "You do now give up yourself, soul and body, and all that you have, are, or shall be, unto God, through Jesus Christ, *to serve him* forever, and to be his, and at his disposal in all things."

For the first time in two hundred and fifty years of church covenanting, the promise of service receives distinct recognition. The significant words, "to serve him," are brought in, and the word sovereign quietly drops out. The Calvinism is softened, and the idea of Christian life as God's service is brought into the foreground. The first believers in New Haven in 1639 were content to promise to be taught and governed in all things by Christ, their lawgiver and king. The next generation added also the confession that they were at God's "sovereign disposal in all things;" believers in the same church some hundred and fifty years later, in the first flush and joy of the missionary age, dropping the word "sovereign" from their more filial sense of God, although retaining the avowal that they were his forever, and at his disposal in all things, and still acknowledging, as did their Puritan fathers, that Christ is "lawgiver and king," were not content to complete their covenant with God, and with one another as a Christian church, without adding the express promise to give themselves up "to serve him forever." So finally the revision of the Christian idea of life under the missionary motive of service, and the Christianization of God's sovereignty through Jesus's revelation of God as love, find reflection and expression in the covenant of the church. And this great change in it was introduced so naturally and spontaneously that it was spoken of as only a slight verbal alteration.

One more step brings this history of this creed revision through the unconscious processes of life to its present period. The idea of service has come to fuller recognition in the "Form for Admission of Members," which was reported a few years ago by our Congregational Creed Commission, and which is now used in the First Church in New Haven. With perhaps equal unconsciousness of change on the part of those who framed this form of covenant for our use, the conception of life as a duty owed to the Divine Sovereignty falls somewhat into the background, while at the same time the authority of the Word of God as the Christian law is retained; but the idea is brought into the bright foreground of the "fellowship and communion of the church," and the words of dedication are expanded to this fuller and richer promise: "You consecrate yourselves unto God, and your life to his service."

So the distinctive type of modern Christian character finds natural expression in our covenant, as an earlier type of manhood was found reflected in the forms in which our fathers confessed their faith. Is not each type, and its expression in the creed, providentially determined and adapted to the needs and duties of its time? If it was given to men of other generations to lay foundations under a tremendous sense of the Divine Sovereignty, it is the call of a missionary age, under an inspiring sense of Christ's universal atonement, to form and fashion its church covenants in the truth of life consecrated to service. The Christian Church of to-day is signally and happily called and chosen to consecrate all that it has of talent, means, and personal influence to the service of God among the people.

THE RUSSIAN EDICT AGAINST THE JEWS.

From *The Universalist*, Chicago, August 6, 1890.

THE following is an abstract of the new repressive edicts directed against the Jews of Russia, writes a correspondent of the London *Times:*

1. Jews throughout Russia (and including Russian Poland) must henceforth reside in towns only, and not in the country. No Jew will any longer be permitted to own land or even to farm land. All Jewish land owners, farmers, and agricultural laborers will thus be expelled from their village homes, and, unless they have saved the means of subsistence, will be reduced to beggary. To intensify the severity of this edict, and widen its scope, the Government officials have included many hundreds of small towns in the category of country villages, and expelled the Jews from those towns. In this manner the number of sufferers from the edict is greatly augmented. Tens of thousands of souls will be thus rendered homeless. These laws, known as the "May laws," were promulgated in 1882, but were never put into force until the present year.

2. Jews have hitherto been allowed by law to reside in only sixteen of the counties (gubernia) of Russia. But the law has not been enforced against Jewish merchants in many important commercial centres outside those provinces, such as Riga, Liban, Rostoff, etc., for, by a Ministerial circular of 1880, Jews, long established in such towns were permitted to remain unmolested. The law is now to be strictly enforced, and, by a recent Ministerial order, all Jews, numbering many thousands of families, settled outside the sixteen counties, are to be expelled.

3. Jewish artisans, who in like manner, had, under the law of 1865, been permitted to settle temporarily in places outside the sixteen counties, are now to be expelled from those places. Tens of thousands of artisans, with their families, will, it is said, be affected by this edict, and rendered homeless.

4. Jews are no longer to be allowed to be in any way connected with mines or mining industry, nor even to hold shares in any mine.

5. The Jews will henceforth be practically debarred from partaking in any educational advantages, whether in schools, gymnasia, or universities. Hitherto they have been allowed admission, subject to the limitation that their number should not exceed 5 per cent of the total number of students. Secret instructions have already been sent requiring the reduction of this small percentage to still lower limits, and from many of the higher educational institutions all Jewish students have been expelled.

6. The legal profession, in which heretofore a large number of Jews in Russia have achieved great success, will in future be closed to Jewish students. A law has already been put in force requiring the special sanction of the Minister of the Interior before a Jew, qualified by examination, may practise. Since the promulgation of the law not a single sanction has been given, and it is understood that none will be given.

7. Jews are henceforth prohibited from following the profession of engineer or army doctor, or from filling any Government post, however subordinate.

In the days of the Emperor Nicholas it was a subject of reproach to the Russian Jews that they were all traders and not producers. That reproach has since been wiped away, and now an enormous proportion have become skilled artisans, agriculturists, and professional men, all adding largely to the wealth of the empire. But under the new repressive laws all this communal progress is to be reversed, the artisan, the farmer, and the professional men are all to be ruined, and those who survive the persecution must become traders in the overcrowded towns.

It is estimated that the total number of persons who will be expelled from their homes under the new law will not be far from 1,000,000.

The *Baltimore Sun*, in a recent article on this topic, writes as follows : " The Hebrew bankers of Europe have succeeded in staying the iron hand of the Czar, which was about to fall with crushing weight upon the unfortunate Jews of Russia. The barbarous edicts which were to have been put in force throughout the empire have again been suspended, and it may be that the pinch of pecuniary necessities may even compel the haughty Muscovite to consent to some amelioration in the condition of a people weakened by centuries of persecution, yet strong in the support of their prosperous brethren in other lands. The condition of the Russian Jews is already deplorable, but if the cruelly proscriptive ukases had been carried into effect it would have passed the bounds of endurance, and a wholesale emigration from Russia must have been the result. No more striking evidence of the power of money could be provided than in the fact that the autocratic will of the Czar and the blind fanaticism of his subjects were curbed by a simple intimation from the leading Hebrew financiers of Germany, England, Austria, and France, that if the anti-Jewish crusade were persisted in there would be a general combination against Russian stocks which could not fail to produce destructive results. The Rothschilds are said to have been the leaders of the combination, and their remonstrances have resulted in the assurance from the Russian Government that the condition of its Hebrew subjects would not be made worse. In this instance capital has demonstrated its capacity for unselfish and generous action. The Hebrew bankers might, perhaps, have found it more prudent not to have antagonized the Czar, but the sufferings of their race in Russia touched a sympathetic chord and caused them to subordinate every consideration to the one great purpose of protecting their helpless brethren from further persecution. It is one of the finest traits of the Jewish character that it seldom fails to respond ungrudgingly to appeals for help from unfortunate members of the Hebrew race. In no other people do we find the same degree of mutual helpfulness and race solidarity. It is this spirit which has enabled them, despite their dispersion over the face of the globe, to preserve their individuality as a people and to accomplish splendid results in almost every sphere of human effort."

MUCH ADMIRED PREACHERS.

BY E. B.

From *The Christian Register* (Unitarian), Boston, August 4, 1890.

The love of admiration is common : perhaps some will call it universal. Yet some little children are free from self-consciousness, and take no more praise to themselves than the grass for growing or the rain for falling, to borrow a particularly applicable illustration. And sometimes people have that moral simplicity that, when they leave far behind them the years of infancy, they remain unconscious still of any merit in their natural graces and their mental acquisitions. Doubtless, it will be admitted that we ought all to remain free from self-consciousness ; but, when the little child is told, " Now speak the piece for the lady," or is admired for its fair flesh of arm or bosom, it very readily learns to value itself for what others see in it to value. The sense of the admiration of the ball-room naturally follows upon the admiration expressed in the nursery for the little maiden ; and the young man learns to be proud of his early verses in print or his declamations before his class in college. And the great consideration with which youth are taught to regard themselves rather grows with the growth, and declines not with the increase, of years. And, if the world thinks highly of us, why should we not have for ourselves the same degree of estimation ?

Yet scarcely any foible is more offensive than conceit of one's self. And its offensiveness is not to be found alone in the injustice which it inflicts upon others, in professing to be better than they are, not in the obtrusiveness with which it displays its own deserts ; but still more it is found in the injustice toward the Giver of all good, in claiming for one's self what is only an inspiration from above. The baby never made its little toes and fingers to be beautiful, and all its charms of prattling speech and pattering feet come from the same source as the petals of the rose and the sweetness of the violet. And, throughout all the world of human excellences, we see only the divine work of that same spirit which set forth the spacious firmament on high, with all the blue ethereal sky. Do not, like a thief, deny to the Creator the origin of the gifts with which he has adorned you, nor fail to consider that so little praise is due to yourself for them that the changes of a day or an hour may deprive you of the possession of them. Even if you called to mind that by the voluntary work of hard study you have attained to superior learning, or by great efforts of self-denial and of ambitious design you have acquired wealth or power or position, you may reflect you built upon a foundation laid by the Divine Artificer, and, had that never been laid in your behalf, you might be now no better than the beggar and the idiot. Did the official make himself, as he rides in the procession or shakes hands with the thousand in the presidential parlor? or the young girl in laces and satins create her own beauty, as with glowing cheeks she receives the flattering bows and speeches of her admirers?

But is it not profane to compare the preacher with these humbler instances of self-consciousness? Doubtless there are many preachers who never felt their faces tingle at words of praise with which their sermons have been rewarded. Doubtless some preachers are so possessed with a high idea of their vocation that they cannot be made to think of any reward due to themselves, but only consider whether their work has been faithfully performed, and souls have been comforted or have been converted by them. And all the effect of the admiring commendation they are met with as they come down from the pulpit is to raise their own ideal and to make them feel how far short of their ideal they have come. Do you remember what John Bunyan said to his hearer who told him at the close of service he had preached a good sermon? "Yes," said he, "the devil told me that before I came down from the pulpit: it was Bunyan, I think." Yet the sincere preacher would not receive coldly or repulsively the gratitude of an instructed hearer. He would himself be grateful, too; but it would be with a gratitude mingled largely with devoutness and with love, and not at all with a selfish complacency or a vulgar pride. And the preacher may naturally, at times, feel empty and discouraged, being himself human, because no drops of sweet and gentle commendation fall upon him, and the congregation leave the house of worship with never a sign of recognition offered to their instructor.

But why should not the preacher be spoiled by the vast degree of notice which is usually taken of him? For his hour or two each week he stands up in his elevated place, and no one looks at another than him. He expects attention to his every word, to be followed in every thought, to be noticed for every brilliant expression; and this general attention he receives. How high-minded, how true-hearted such a man must be, not at times to be affected by all the tokens of attention paid to him! And sometimes such tokens are excessive. Even the feeble preachers may sometimes utter a sentence deserving notice; and what if the preacher is not feeble, but strong in heart and intellect, and superior to most of those whose talents he has been permitted to measure! He shall feel his superiority: he would scarcely be true if he failed to do so. And yet many wise preachers show their superiority to be felt by them, not over their brethren of the pulpit, but over the judgments of men flattering and faithful.

But who shall tell the preacher that he is not responsible to man, nor a competitor for human praise, nor to be allowed to think highly of himself, more than he ought to think? His flatterers will not tell him, and his wisest hearers are not likely to find it their duty to do it. Is there any reason that he should not by himself correct himself of all self-consciousness? If, for the sake of the world's vain praise, he turns a sentence gracefully, if he provides a few flowers of speech or utters a few strong words, can he not check himself, as much as he would if tempted in the pulpit to tell falsehoods or use profanity? Is there any less reward for truthfulness of spirit in the sermon than there is for truthfulness of word in buying meat of the butcher? And would it not be as painful to think that one had swaggered in the street to attract the attention of school-boys as to think that one had preached himself and made antics before high Heaven? The church edifice was dedicated, from corner-stone to topmost tower, in pew and in pulpit alike, all a hallowed place; but who is there, wishing to be in Heaven hereafter amid the choirs of saints and angels, or to go forth from their assembly on missions of benevolence to men, that does not also labor for that high condition of soul in which he shall recognize the presence of living souls on earth, and that hallowed relationship which under God he bears to them? None can value the pulpit too highly. The true preacher thinks not of a reward: he only asks to be able to do in reverence and in love the duty of his place.

IS INFANT BAPTISM DECLINING?

From the *Independent*, New York, August 28, 1890.

THE fact that the Congregational denomination reports only 8,889 infant baptisms for the past year, serves as an occasion for *The Christian Inquirer* (Baptist) to say that infant baptism is decaying. *The Examiner* and other Baptist papers have frequently said the same thing. It would not at all trouble us if the assertion were true; but we cannot blind our eyes to the fact that it is not true. It is a question easily settled; and we propose to drop into statistics in a friendly way in order to show what the real truth is.

The differences in the returns of the Congregational denomination for infant baptisms of one year with another are not very great. While the number given this year is 8,889 the number given for last year was 8,328, for the year before 11,966, and for the year before that 7,364. In 1884 the figures were 5,801. There has been a steady increase since 1880 with the exception of 1887, when the number was abnormally large. In that year there was also a much larger number of adult baptisms than usual. There has really been no falling off in any year since 1880 except from the unusual figures of 1887. So much for the Congregational denomination.

Now let us take up some of the Presbyterian Churches. In the Northern Church, beginning with 1884, there has been a steady increase of infant baptisms. The figures for that year were 19,403; the figures for 1889, 24,566. This shows an absolute increase of nearly 5,000. The same figures also show a relative increase. For example, in 1884 infant baptisms were in the proportion of one to every thirty-one and six-tenths members. In 1889 the proportion was as one to thirty and seven-tenths members. The statistics of the United Presbyterian Church show a similar growth. In 1887 the pastors of that denomination baptized 4,316 infants; in 1889 they baptized 5,002, and in 1890, 4,528. This shows a falling off for one year only of nearly 400.

In none of the Churches whose statistics we have examined do we find any evidence of an absolute decline in infant baptisms. In the Reformed German Church 13,743 infants were baptized in 1888, and in 1889 14,469. In the Reformed Dutch Church the number of baptisms in 1887 was 4,669, in 1888 4,751, in 1889 5,238. In the Methodist Episcopal Church there were 74,638 infant baptisms in 1887, 72,305 in 1888 and 74,015 in 1889. There is evidence of variation in these statistics from year to year, but no proof of decline. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, baptized 32,633 infants in 1887, 31,052 in 1888 and 34,733 in 1889. There is no evidence of decline here. The Evangelical Association, which is commonly considered a member of the Methodist family of denominations, baptized 9,528 infants in 1888 and 9,936 in 1889.

Here are statistics for some of the Pedo-Baptist denominations which report on the subject. There are a number of such denominations which do not report such statistics; for example, the Lutheran body, where doubtless the ratio of infant baptism to membership is as large as it is in the two Reformed bodies—the German and the Dutch. There is also the Roman Catholic Church which is careful to baptize all its infants. It would be idle to say that there is any probable decline in the number of infant baptisms in the Roman Catholic Church or in the various Lutheran bodies. Nor is it credible that there has been a decline in the Protestant Episcopal Church. There are a few cases in which the statistics of Roman Catholic dioceses include the number of infant baptisms. For example, in the arch-diocese of New Orleans, which returns a Catholic population of about 300,000, the number of infant baptisms given for 1889 was 14,274. This indicates a ratio of one to 21.

It is curious to notice the difference in the ratio of infant baptisms to membership in different denominations. In the Congregational it is the lowest of all that we have examined, being only one to 55 communicants. The next lowest to the Congregational denomination is the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in which the ratio is one to thirty-three and nine-tenths. In the Presbyterian Church (Northern) it is thirty-one and seven-tenths; in the Methodist Episcopal Church thirty and two-tenths; in the Reformed Dutch Church seventeen; in the Evangelical Association (German Methodistic) fourteen and six-tenths; in the Reformed German Church thirteen and nine-tenths. It is easy of course to understand why it is that the German and Dutch Churches exhibit a much higher ratio than those Churches of purely English or American origin. Infant baptism is made much more of by the Germans than by other bodies. The exceedingly low ratio of infant baptism to membership in the Congregational denomination is hardly to be explained by imperfection of statistics, though nearly all denominational statistics will under-estimate the number of baptisms. A much more valid explanation is found in the fact that there is a very small proportion of children born in New England, where marriages take place abnormally late in life. Thus in Rhode Island and Connecticut the proportion of baptism to members (including absentees) is about one to 60, in Massachusetts one to 74; in Vermont one to 119; in New Hampshire one to 132; and in Maine one to 199.

SUNDAY-SCHOOL PROPRIETIES.

From *The Examiner* (Baptist), New York, August 28, 1890.

A FUNDAMENTAL propriety relating to the Sunday-school is that it should not be the children's church. We lately heard an intelligent and devout member of one of our city churches say, "No children come to our services any more. They go to the Sunday-school, but we don't see whole families together at church." There is no question that a tendency in this direction exists. It has been often recognized and deprecated. Protests against it have become commonplaces. But the evil is real and serious. Nothing can make up to children for the loss of the church-going habit and the formative, educating influences of regular attendance at public worship. A great many of the wisest and best people do not hesitate to declare their conviction that if in any case or for any reason there must be a choice between church and Sunday-school, the school had better be given up and not the church. Some of the most judiciously applied Sunday-school prizes we have known were for attendance at church. They had the good effect not only of encouraging that, but also of deepening interest in the Sunday-school itself.

Another axiomatic propriety of the Sunday-school is that it should be a place where something is taught and learned. This involves the training of teachers and study by the scholars. A normal class under competent direction is generally indispensable. The incapacity of the average teachers has been often denounced. We do not believe that it will be most satisfactorily counteracted by massing scholars in large groups with a few teachers of exceptional ability. Such a plan sacrifices much that is important in the work and influence of the Sunday-school, and can never largely prevail. But the requirement of regular attendance at the teachers' meeting or normal class may fairly be made. We know of one school where refusal to comply with it disqualifies a person for the office of teacher. The rule may seem stringent, and should, of course, be open to reasonable exceptions, but its principle is obviously sound.

As for study by the scholars, the first thing to be insisted on is knowledge of the Scripture text. The more of it actually committed to memory the better. Lesson helps are valuable and should be faithfully used, but their place is not in the class. There every scholar should have a Bible, and learn to handle it with facility. It would be ludicrous, if it were not mournful, to see the lack of familiarity with the Bible betrayed by many Sunday-school scholars who have been brought up on "quarterlies." The small additional outlay and trouble required to secure the use of Bibles are amply repaid. No mistake can be greater than to fear a loss of interest and attractiveness if serious study is attempted. The schools which prove in the long run most popular and successful are those in which there is real teaching and learning.

Sunday-school music is too large a topic to be disposed of in a paragraph. We can only venture the suggestion that it should embrace now and then tunes that have true harmony, and words that have some claim to poetical beauty. Material of this kind abounds and has been found available when fairly tried. We have heard such hymns as Newman's "Lead, kindly Light," and Gerhardt's "O sacred head now wounded," sung with correctness and feeling by a roomful of children. The verses learned in Sunday-school are likely to be remembered through life. We shall all agree that jingles about "golden rafters" and "jasper seas" are worse than lumber in memory's storehouse. It is, moreover, in every way desirable that our choicest church hymns should become familiar to the children by Sunday-school practice.

It is easy to say that Sunday-school proprieties should embrace reverence and good manners. But the enforcement of these points is beset with practical difficulties. Discipline in the Sunday-school is confessedly a delicate matter, for the reason that attendance is voluntary and even solicited, and also because the scholars who require discipline are the very ones most in need of what the Sunday-school can do for them. The ideal to be aimed at is for teachers to overcome disorder by interesting their scholars. This is, however, by no means always practicable at first in the hardest cases. Much may be done through personal influence outside the school. There ought to be co-operation in this direction on the part of parents. It is far from being true that the most unruly scholars come from the poorest and rudest homes. And certainly parents should have the chief interest in the good breeding and right spirit of their children. But, unfortunately, help cannot be always counted on from that quarter. Where everything else fails, and the issue lies between expelling an incorrigible scholar and sacrificing the profit of a whole class, the heroic measure must be taken. It may turn out for the good even of the mischief-maker.

Reverence is greatly stimulated in children by careful attention to certain outward details. The devotional part of the Sunday-school service should never be allowed to go on while scholars are tittering, and whispering, and gazing about the room. Negligence in this respect is a lesson in irreverence. A devotional attitude should always be assumed by the scholars before prayer is offered. This should begin with the infant class. It is a pretty sight to see the little ones fold their hands, and bow their heads, and close their eyes when they repeat the Lord's Prayer, and during the prayer of their teacher. The influence of this simple act of reverence upon the plastic mind of the child cannot be estimated.

HOW TO GET RID OF THE PASTOR.

From the *Central Baptist*, St. Louis, August 14, 1890.

Two difficult tasks in turn confront our churches. The first is the calling of a pastor. As soon as there is a vacancy and the search for a new man begins, the brethren discover that this particular church is very peculiar, and that only a rare man will fill the bill. The retiring pastor made the same discovery months before, and it was because he was just an ordinary man with no eccentricities and supernatural endowments invented to fit their whims, that he decided to retire.

The standard is set up for the new man to fill. He must be brilliant, must be good-looking, with a light complexioned tone of voice. He must have good taste in dress. He must have the knack of drawing the young people and of making them follow him. His family must be stylish and not too numerous. In a country where men are not made to order, it is not always easy to find exactly what is wanted.

A more delicate and difficult task, however, is to get rid of a pastor and to do it in a way that is considered graceful and genteel. Of course it would not do to rise in open rebellion, or to demand his resignation by official action ; nor yet would it be considered just the thing for the deacons to go to him and have a frank conference in the matter. There are other ways of doing the thing. We are afraid the churches which would use the method we are going to suggest are already familiar with it and will not allow us the credit of helping them. Still, there may be a few churches in the rural regions, untaught in this way of doing things, and, therefore, we suggest the following indirect process of sending away a pastor that has not the happy faculty of pleasing everybody.

Tell him how much you love him and how deeply the prospect of losing him pains you, but that really it is going to be impossible to raise his salary. You know his income was already reduced to the exact point of suffering, and that the next turn of the screw forces him out. To make good your assertion, scale down your own contribution, and do not fail to tell the brethren that there is a general reduction going on. If there are any disgruntled members, now is their time. Poor David was not aware he had such enemies until they stoned him as he fled before the face of Absalom. Tell them about the hard times, the removal of members, the stinginess of some and of the poverty of others. It don't take long to do it this way, and it can be done under cover of apparent devotion and sincerity.

It is not safe while this plan is working to remark that our duty to support the worship of God's house and to give as the Lord has prospered us, is independent of our little feelings about the man who happens to fill the pulpit. The end would be defeated by calling a few of the brethren together and praying for a larger measure of the grace of liberality. There is only one way to succeed and that is to make everybody believe that the subscription is falling off and that there is good reason for the decline.

There is no more effective way of getting rid of the pastor than this we have suggested. Nine-tenths of the Baptist pastors of Missouri would be compelled to resign or to suffer if their salaries were reduced only ten per cent. And then it is one of the most powerful arguments with some of the members. If there is a dissatisfied or stingy one among them it is no trouble to influence him to reduce his liberality.

Another way is for a few of the members to leave off regular attendance at the services. The success of the pastorate depends on the assured presence and help of these few. He expects them at every service. When he thinks of resigning, these punctual, sympathizing, ever-present faces protest most powerfully against his going, and he makes up his mind not to desert them. But when they fail him, he is discouraged. If you have made up your mind that he ought to resign, do not tell him so, but instead, keep away from the meetings. Mention to the brethren now and then that the services have lost interest and that attendance is falling off.

If there is any room for it, make an unfavorable comparison with some other preacher and congregation in town. Breed a spirit of discouragement in the congregation. Not much talent is required to fill the office of discourager. The pastor will soon find that matters are wrong, and he will begin to pray for guidance as to what his duty is.

If he is strongly entrenched in the hearts of the people and in his purpose to remain, it may be necessary to tell him a few of his failings. Of course he has them, and then some complaints which are not well grounded can be laid against him. There are a few families he has not visited as often as others. Touch him up on that point. Remind him that conversions have been few the last year. Suggest that one style of preaching grows monotonous, and that a change in some way would quicken an interest. Lay on him the responsibility of bickerings between certain members of the church, and make him feel that his failure to keep things sweet shows a want of adaptiveness. Regale him with all the delinquencies and sins and inconsistences that idle gossip can stir up. All this will make him feel that his preaching and influence are waning and that it is best to make a change.

There is one fact which helps to make it as easy to get rid of a pastor as to secure one, there are generally more members helping to accomplish it. We know people who put in, not only their best, but, their only licks to bring about a resignation. That is their forte. They can promote a resignation better than an election. They can vote louder on a dismissal than on a call.

Nine-tenths of the resignations are brought about by frivolous consideration and by the agitation of faults which could be easily corrected with half the effort spent in cultivating them. In nine cases out of ten, the churches could help the pastor overcome the very mistakes for which he is forced to resign.

CANON LIDDON.

From *The Churchman* (Episcopal), New York, September 20, 1890.

The death of Canon Liddon is a severe loss to the whole Anglican communion, but especially to London and St. Paul's, where, for twenty years, his light has shone with steady lustre. It was as residentiary canon of St. Paul's that his great work was done in addressing himself to the claims of educated men, who, though retaining an outward allegiance to the faith, were at heart doubtful or indifferent. Singularly enough, in 1867, only three years before his appointment to St. Paul's, Dr. Liddon wrote to a friend (A. H. Mackonochie)—" Men of the class for whom apologetic conferences would be designed would never put their foot within a church on a week-day, and the preacher would address a few good people who had no doubts about the faith. I think that any such lectures could only be given on Sunday, if they are to succeed. . . . People who do not believe, or who believe only in bits of Christianity, will go to church on Sunday from sheer ennui, and then they might by God's grace be got hold of. But a week-day has Parliament, the clubs, Rotten Row, and plenty of business —serious and the reverse." But for many years past the week-day sermons under the dome of St. Paul's, and Liddon's first of all, have attracted multitudes of busy men from the heart of the city. The Bampton Lectures of 1866 on the Divinity of Jesus Christ opened the way not only to his promotion to St. Paul's, but to the special work which he was destined to achieve among the class of men of whom about the same time he wrote to his friend so doubtfully. The precision and acuteness of thought, as well as the scholarship exhibited in those lectures, appearing at a crisis of intellectual debate when the whole controversy was centering in the question, " What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He ?" marked their author a champion of the faith once delivered to the saints to whom the Church of England might safely confide her cause, and the bugle-call then sounded never failed to repeat its "rally" to the last sermon in St. Paul's. The lectures have passed through many editions, and have made good their title to a permanent place in the library of Anglo-Catholic theology. They restate the catholic doctrine of Christ with a freshness and an adaptation to the tone and temper of the age that is invaluable. Yet whoever has listened to Dr. Liddon in St. Paul's, and considered the influence which has radiated thence for the defence and confirmation of the faith, will be disposed to admit our claim that the results of his sermons during that twenty years are likely to outlast the usefulness of his printed lectures, in handing down the deposit of faith whole and undefiled to generations yet unborn.

Beginning his ministry on Christmas Eve, 1852, in the parish of Wantage, which, under the Rev. W. Butler, afterward Dean of Lincoln, was notable for its elaborate parochial machinery and efficient organization, and for graduating its curates to important and honorable promotion, Liddon at once attracted public attention by his eloquence and solid merit. In the summer of 1854, when but twenty-five years of age, he was appointed vice-principal of the theological college at Cuddesdon, serving also as examining chaplain to the Bishop of Salisbury. In 1864 he was made prebendary of Salisbury, and in 1870 canon-resident of St. Paul's, Ireland Professor of Exegesis at Oxford, and Doctor of Divinity and Doctor of Civil Law of the same university. He was three times appointed Select Preacher at Oxford.

Upon the death of Dr. Pusey he undertook the preparation of a biography of that eminent person, and on the plea of that sacred task he declined the only bishopric (Scotch) which was offered him. The story that his elevation to the episcopate was opposed by the queen in resentment for his plain-speaking in a sermon preached before her majesty by command, is too apocryphal for comment. Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury were his ardent admirers and steadfast personal friends, and it is more probable that they and he felt that his post as preacher at St. Paul's was too singularly his own special work to be meddled with. He died suddenly at Weston, Super Mare, on Tuesday, September 9, at the age of sixty-one. His Life of Pusey was promised for publication during the coming year, and may be supposed to have neared its completion, though the final touches must now be added by another hand.

THE "CHURCH SUPPORT" SYMPOSIUM.

[Brief Reasons for Various Theories of Church Support.]

I.

The Tithe.

BY REV. CHARLES R. BONNELL, RECTOR OF ST. STEPHEN CHURCH, MANAYUNK, PHILADELPHIA, EDITOR OF LESLIE'S "DIVINE RIGHT OF TITHES," ETC.

God Provides for His House by Tithes and Offerings.

All religious appointments are to be considered in view of their effect, whether temporary or abiding, whether ceremonial or moral. The experience of our forefathers is our legacy. Even the ceremonial law is instructive, for whatever it appointed was to have its effect upon worshippers. "Great principles and questions are permanent, only the accidents of them become obsolete."

The Tithe was a religious duty before the ceremonial law was given. It held its place during the Law, and was acknowledged by it. It continued to be regarded after the Law, even by those who had not received the Law. The "Tithe" was not limited to the Levitical dispensation, because the duty it fulfilled was a continuous one, common to mankind. The Levitical law was designed to fit those for Christ to whom it was given. When they became Christians they no longer observed its types and ceremonies. The "Tithe," being neither type nor ceremony, but an acknowledgment of God as the Sovereign Creator and Preserver, has existed since God created man, and the reason for it must last while God sustains man upon earth.

The will of God is not only expressed by a law written on stone or in books, but is perceived and kept by "faith." Israel failed to keep the righteousness of the Law because Israel sought it not by faith, but by works. The uncircumcision who keep the righteousness of the Law show the work of the Law written in their hearts; they do that which is right before God. Tithe, therefore, is not to be neglected by those who are under grace. It is a divinely accepted token of the worship of the Most High God, possessor of heaven and earth. The law of the spirit of life, which makes us free from the law of sin and death, does not free us from the law of righteousness; but the righteousness of the Law is fulfilled by those who walk in the Spirit, having faith in Christ as the true God. As such He is served willingly (Ps. cx. 3). Christ gives us His Spirit that the righteousness of the Law may be fulfilled in us. Wherefore Christians, freed from the ceremonial law, "are not without law to God, but are under the law to Christ." They hold all for Him, and that they may use it faithfully and intelligently they follow definite and systematic methods, as the safeguards of freedom and liberality. Now since Holy Writ connects "Tithe" with the worship and house of God, and since God provided by the Tithe for the support of His ministers under the Law, until He appoints another way we reasonably look to Tithes for the support of His ministers under the Gospel. The Lord hath ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel. It must therefore be productive of revenue. Where is this revenue if it be not in the Tithe always due to God, always connected with His house and worship, and which we are taught is to be paid to the King of Righteousness, the true Melchisedec, our Lord Jesus Christ? (See Heb. vii.) The apostles taught Christians boldly to refuse the restrictions of the ceremonial law, yet in this Epistle to the Hebrews, the father of the faithful is set forth as an example, paying Tithe to the King of Righteousness. Although the priesthood of Aaron is set aside, "Tithe" is still regarded as the token of worship, and is paid as to the ever-living and only abiding Priest, our Lord. It is written that dying men no longer receive Tithes, but He receiveth them who ever liveth. How shall Christ, our great High Priest and King, receive them if Christians do not pay them? But when they are paid to Him as Lord of all, they become the revenue of His kingdom, the meat of His house, and provide the hire of those whom He calls to work in His vineyard. Do not those who oppose Tithes dishonor Him, who has made no other provision for His house, and who says, "If any provide not for his own house, he is greatly culpable"? Our Lord said that tithing should not be left undone (Matt. xxiii. 23). Wherefore? Because it is as much due to God one time as another, if men acknowledge Him as their Creator and Preserver. The Christian rule, "according to ability," "as every man hath received, so let him give," applies to his duty to his fellow-man as well as to his duty to God, but he must first acknowledge God, honoring Him with his substance, and with the first-fruits of all his increase. His "giving" must be constant and systematic. The Tithe, first separated, will provide to-day as it did of old for abundant ministrations and for extending the kingdom of God. Many, diverse, and questionable plans will continue to be used for the support of divine worship without abiding success, while the divine plan of Tithe is rejected.

The recognition of what is due to God, by changeless right, which tithing maintains, enabled our ancestors not only to support the Church, but to lay the foundation of many benefits now enjoyed. The same dutiful acknowledgment of God's sovereignty and providence, by Tithes and offerings, would abundantly sustain His work among us and make all Christian works to flourish.

The minister of Christ must remember that he is called and sent forth to preach "the kingdom of God." "Freely ye have received, freely give." He must look to his Employer for his support. He must teach that "Tithe" is due to Christ as Lord of all, and set forth the blessing (temporal also) that follows its faithful payment. He will then not be content to be a hireling of men, nor regard his support as payment from men. He will accept only what has been offered to the Lord, whose servant he is, and for whom the meat of God's house is provided.

PARAGRAPHIC.

Perhaps all men who have shown remarkable power in controlling untutored savages have been men of great personal magnetism, men whose glance was sufficient to strike terror or win confidence and affection. General Gordon was a man of slight frame, with a strange, far-away light in his eyes which seemed to inspire the natives with awe. Stanley, also, is said to have eyes of singular power and changefulness of expression. One of his European companions describes them as follows: "He first looks at the natives as if he were going to eat them, and then, when they give in and do what he wants, he looks as if he had done so, and was grateful to them for the meal."—*Christian Herald, Detroit.*

"Is that a Landseer, Mr. Crœsus?" asked the visitor, pausing before the painting. "No," replied the host, "reckon it is a Durham. See how broad it is between the horns, and see the color and curl on its forehead. That's a genuine Durham, sure."—*Salem Gazette.*

Mrs. Marchmont: Why, Jane, where are the young ladies? I thought I heard them come in an hour ago.

Jane: So you did, mem; they'd been to the cooking school, mem, and the three of them's been down in the kitchen ever since, bilin' a egg, mem.

"What is an agnostic?" asked Rollo. "An agnostic," replied Uncle George, "is a man who loudly declares that he knows nothing, and abuses you if you believe him."—*Burdette.*

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE CREED AND MODERN THOUGHT. By the REV. B. FRANKLIN, D.D. New York, E. & J. B. Young & Co., 1881. 12mo, pp. 407. $1.75.

Although published some years ago, this book has not, we think, received the attention it deserves. It is the production of a well-read, thoughtful, and enthusiastic mind, and one which ordinary readers may find very satisfying, and clergymen may find helpful in their teaching work. It is not intended, primarily, for the more limited class of readers, and hence the style has not the severe precision which suits the philosophic mind, and enables it more readily to judge whether progress has been made in the advancement of any science, or in the clarification of its statements. It is, rather, diffuse, popular, animated, and colored by æsthetic emotion.

The work is, first, a commentary on the Creed, the Niceno-Constantinopolitan symbol; not exhaustively exegetical, after the manner of Bishop Pearson, but sufficiently so to meet the immediate requirement. It is, rather, and chiefly, argumentative and somewhat philosophical, bringing out the profound meaning of the Christian Belief by contrasting it with rival and Antichristian schemes. These are adverted to, their substance reproduced and criticized. Hence ordinary readers, unfamiliar with these and the extensive literature in which they are contained, may find here a summary, generally just, of the arguments by which they are defended and those by which they may be controverted. The advocates of some of these might, indeed, object to the presentation here given, as failing to exhibit their full strength. Notably this may be true with reference to the Hegelian philosophy, whose advocates claim for it that it is, eminently, the Christian philosophy, and one of the strongest bulwarks of the Christian Faith. In making utterances about this, it behoves even thoughtful writers to be very cautious, and to hazard no adverse characterization of the same unsupported by argument. But the more superficial philosophic schemes, Materialism, Subjective Idealism, Positivism, and Agnosticism, are fairly and justly dealt with, and the reader who has use for the controverting argument may find here, in condensed form, material aid.

And all this is accompanied by an illuminating commentary upon the Creed itself. For instance, the author, taking note of the Latin singular form, "Credo," and the Greek plural, "Pistenomen," takes occasion from this to indicate, in a very searching way, human personality and responsibility, and, on the other hand, the organic unity of the human race, physical, intellectual and moral, showing, at the same time, how these supplement each other, and, when combined only, present the completed truth.

There is little or no attempt in the work to discuss what may be regarded as the unsettled problems of Theology—such as the single or double procession of the Holy Spirit—the Kenosis involved in the Incarnation—the true meaning of the Sacrificial Atonement. To have gone deeply into these might have made the work more speculative, and less fitted, possibly, for the larger class of readers, for whose satisfaction it is sufficient. Yet we often detect the signs of a truly philosophic mind, showing the ability to deal with such questions. And there are many germs of thought very tempting to follow out.

Were we ourselves disposed to be critical, we might question the author's statement of the Trichotomy, and the eschatological conclusions drawn therefrom, but to do so for any result would require an ample discussion.

We think that this book may be profitably used, in theological study, in connection with the work of Bishop Pearson. Although it has been a defect in the theological courses of the Episcopal Church that doctrine has been studied only in the form of Commentaries upon the Creed and the Thirty-Nine Articles—*i.e.*, in an order not logical, and therefore not truly systematic, yet works like these should not be neglected, and only require to be supplemented by others or by professorial work. The scriptural support of the articles of Christian belief should be made familiar to every theological student; the movement of the Christian mind in the historical development of doctrine should also be well studied; and both these as a preparation for the more difficult task of weaving a self-coherent system, which shall be impregnable to all attacks. In this regard, while not exactly systematic in its form, the work of Dr. Franklin has apologetic value.

The productions in Theology of the Episcopal Church have been too few to allow any coming from real thinkers to be neglected, for they start from a unique standpoint. Always in them the thought of the ages is availed of rather than a new beginning made. The historic continuity is needful to be exhibited, as essential to the perfect method, in Theology as well as in Philosophy. J. STEINFORT KEDNEY.

FARIBAULT, MINN.

A HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE CONFLICTS BETWEEN JESUITS AND SECULARS IN THE REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH, WITH A REPRINT OF CHRISTOPHER BAGSHAW'S "TRUE RELATION OF THE FACTION BEGUN AT WISBICH," AND ILLUSTRATIVE DOCUMENTS. By THOMAS GRAVES LAW, Librarian, Signet Library. London: David Nutt, 1889. Pp. 324, 8vo, cloth, 15*s*.

This volume belongs to a class of historical writings which is coming to have a distinctly recognized sphere of its own, dealing with the sources and origins of history rather than with history itself. Mr. Freeman, the English historian, has remarked that no kind of literature is so ephemeral as historical. That this is so at present is largely the result of the new direction that is being given to historical studies, a direction that no historian has done more to foster than Mr. Freeman himself. History from the earliest to the most recent times is being largely rewritten, in consequence of the new light that has been shed from antiquarian, philological, critical, as well as more distinctly historical researches. The spirit of historical investigation is triumphing over dogmatic prejudices, and the treasures of libraries and court archives that have been hitherto inaccessible are now being opened to the historical student. It is remarkable what a change, under the new knowledge thus obtained, is passing over historical judgments that were once regarded as closed to all further evidence.

The recent work of Father Gasquet on the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII. is an illustration to the point. Whatever criticisms may be made upon some of his conclusions, no English historian will ever go back to the view which has been current ever since Bishop Burnet among Protestant writers. The book before us has a similar corrective function. If the work of Father Gasquet has shown that Henry VIII. and his instruments were guilty of gross wrong and outrage in their treatment of Catholic monks and nuns, no less clearly has this account of the machinations and conspiracies of Catholic Jesuits vindicated Elizabeth and her ministers from the charges brought against them of ruthless persecution and cruelty. It is this feature of the volume that gives it interest and importance for every student of English history. The story well illustrates how obscure and hidden may be the springs of events that become national and epoch-making in their results. A few recusant Catholic priests were imprisoned in a castle of Ely year after year for safe keeping; and among them was a Jesuit missionary. The Jesuit leaven soon began to work, and the result was a division and quarrel, which was finally transferred from England to Rome, and entered as a decisive factor into the settlement of that great controversy between the Catholic and Protestant portions of Christendom, which is the key to all the political as well as religious movements of that most remarkable age. For the reign of Elizabeth represents the heroic and decisive period in the history of Protestantism and of modern civilization, with all its issues of civil and religious freedom. When she came to the throne vacated by the Catholic Mary England was still divided between two antagonistic religious parties. Protestantism in Germany had spent its original force and was wasting its remaining strength in bitter internal controversies. France was slowly but steadily inclining to the Catholic side and preparing for St. Bartholomew. The Inquisition was busy in stamping out the Reformation in Italy, Spain, and the Netherlands. Meanwhile the counter Catholic reform movement was in full sweep. The Council of Trent had given new life to Catholic dogma. A fresh religious enthusiasm had been aroused under the lead of men like Loyola, Xavier and Caraffa. The Jesuit order had been established, founded on the idea of absolute obedience to the Pope, and thus fitted to become the chief instrument in Papal hands of advancing the Catholic revival. That revival swept over Southern Germany, and northward to the shores of England and Scotland. And thus the throne of Protestant Elizabeth became the focus of a concentrated Catholic attack. All the lines of Catholic diplomacy in Italy, Spain, and France were made to converge on the effort to restore the Catholic succession in England. It was a mortal struggle, and its plottings and counter-plottings, though largely hidden under the surface of the history of the times, form a chapter of thrilling interest. Never was statecraft reduced to such a diabolical science of intrigue, duplicity, and conspiracy as in this last half of the sixteenth century, with the three Popes, Pius V., Gregory XIII., and Sixtus V., Philip II., the Duke of Guise, and the Jesuit order on the one side, and Elizabeth and her great ministers. Burleigh and Walsingham, on the other. The simple question was, who could weave the subtlest web of intrigue and dig the deepest pit of falsehood and treachery. To the salvation, if not the honor, of the Protestant cause history records. and this book suggestively illustrates, that no Catholic devices, however concealed under Jesuitical casuistry, could rival the consummate arts of Walsingham. How he was able to play false against false, and make a double-dyed traitor to all others remain true to himself is still one of the unexplained marvels of that marvellous history. We only know that he did it. Witness the Babington conspiracy, in which the archplotters, and even the sinuous but fascinating Mary of Scots herself, were lured to their own self-betrayal and destruction by his dextrous wiles.

But the chief interest and lesson of the book is connected with the light it sheds upon the relations of the Jesuits to this drama, and the effect on the fortunes of Catholicism in England. The English Catholics at first, as a body, were loyal to Elizabeth. Many of the Marian priests conformed to the Book of Common Prayer. But the bull of Pius V., in 1570, excommunicating and deposing the Protestant Queen, troubled Catholic consciences. To obey the Pope now involved disloyalty to the State. It was a cruel dilemma. But the secular clergy still, for the most part, remained firm in their allegiance. They were Catholics, but they were none the less Englishmen, with an Englishman's spirit of loyalty. It was not so with those that joined the Society of Jesus. In becoming Jesuits they ceased to be Englishmen.

At this point the Seminary established at Douai, in 1568, to furnish recruits for the English Catholic priesthood, becomes the centre of interest. This college soon fell under Jesuit control. A similar college was founded at Rome, and another at Valladolid, in Spain. These institutions trained and sent forth the men who formed the vanguard of the Catholic reaction as it surged around Elizabeth's throne. They sowed throughout England the seeds of disloyalty. They upheld the papal bull of deposition. They preached the rightfulness of treason and even assassination. They fomented conspiracies against Elizabeth's life. In the whole grand plot or succession of plots against her, a few English Jesuits are the leading spirits. Indeed, it may be truly asserted that a single individual, of English birth and education, a graduate of Oxford, was the inspiring and presiding genius of that wide and complicated conspiracy against England which had its final issue in the Spanish Armada. Robert Parsons must have been a man of remarkable gifts. Certainly the part he played in this tortuous scheme of English conquest was unique. In this respect history has hitherto failed to do him justice. The most dramatic feature of the book before us is its succession of side-lights illustrating the career of this ablest and most influential of English Jesuits. He led the first forlorn hope to English shores. The English colleges were chiefly his creation. The army of Jesuit missionaries was under his direction. As the scene of intrigue shifts from Rome to Madrid, and from Madrid to Paris and Rheims, this born conspirator appears continually on the stage, gliding from court to court, having the ear of Pope and King alike. Strange to say, he died in his bed, after his schemes had all been foiled, with the halter which he had rescued from the neck of the martyr Campian piously hung around his own.

But Jesuitism, with its fatal doctrines of treason and assassination, was not to conquer in England. This book tells the story of the result. Before the end of Elizabeth's reign English Catholics had answered with a decided negation the question whether the Catholic faith for an Englishman is to mean disloyalty. The very day on which the Queen was taken with her last illness the leading Catholic representatives of England drew up and signed a protestation of allegiance to be delivered to her, in which they declared that they would defend her against all conspiracies, and in case of papal excommunication and censure they were "bound in conscience not to obey."

The question is not without interest today. It was raised afresh in England in 1826, when the Catholic Emancipation Act was passed against great opposition, grounded on the fear that a Catholic's allegiance must be a divided one, and that obedience to the Pope was irreconcilable with loyalty to the State. But English Catholics again repudiated the charge. The Vicars Apostolic who governed the Roman Catholics of Great Britain issued a declaration in which they "declare that neither the Pope nor any other prelate or ecclesiastical person of the Roman Catholic Church has any right to interfere directly or indirectly in the civil government."

But all this was before the Vatican Council of 1870, and its revival of the highest claims ever asserted by a Hildebrand or Innocent III. Mr. Gladstone, in his famous pamphlet "on the Vatican decrees in their bearing on civil allegiance," sounded the note of alarm, affirming that it is impossible for a Catholic who yields implicit obedience to these decrees to remain true under all circumstances to his civil obligations. The answers called forth from Cardinal Manning and other English Catholics were mere evasions. And there the question now rests. But sooner or later it must be once more squarely answered. The Jesuitism of Parsons rules to-day at Rome. The Vatican decrees are a new affirmation and interpretation of the bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII. A cloud, as a man's hand, looms ominously in the political horizon both of England and of America. Again the old question between seculars and Jesuits will be asked and demand reply: Can an Englishman be a Catholic and remain an Englishman? Can an American be a Catholic and remain loyal and true to his birthright and trust as an American citizen?

LEVI L. PAINE.

BANGOR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

SALMON'S INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. An Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament: Being an Expansion of Lectures Delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Dublin. By GEORGE SALMON, D.D., F.R.S., Provost of Trinity College, Dublin; Sometime Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin. Fourth Edition. London: John Murray, 1889. Crown 8vo, 9s.

During the past few years additions of great value have been made to that branch of biblical science to which the name "Introduction" has been assigned. Several recent works under this name have, during the last five years, appeared in the New Testament field. The first is the work now under review, which first appeared in the year 1885. About two years later the *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* by the distinguished Berlin professor, Weiss, was published, and soon after, by its translation in England and its republication in New York, enriched the literature of the subject which is available to all American students. About the time when Weiss's Introduction appeared in English, Dr. Marcus Dods, a Scotch critic and exegete whose name has long been familiar to American scholars, published a small handbook of Introduction adapted especially to the use of students of theology, or of others who were beginning their studies in this branch of biblical science. If we add to these Canon Farrar's volume, entitled *The Messages of the Books*, which is really a New Testament Introduction designed for popular reading, it will be seen that very important advantages are now within our reach for the study of the critical and historic questions which arise in connection with the various writings of the New Testament, which were not available to the student ten years ago—advantages the equal of which could then be enjoyed only by those to whom the treasures of German theological literature were open, and which, in many respects, are superior to those previously afforded.

It is natural to institute a comparison between Dr. Salmon's work, considered as a product of English scholarship, and the equally elaborate and extensive volume of the German professor, Weiss. Both are very learned and exhaustive treatises, but the former, being in the form of lectures, which, at least in great part, were spoken in public, is naturally more diffuse than the latter. The work of Salmon makes the impression of being more apologetic in the sense that the refutation of opinions from which he differs is more directly undertaken. With Weiss the refutation of divergent views is more incidentally introduced, the effort being to point out that they are inconsistent with conclusions which have been previously reached and established. Weiss's criticism enters into a much more searching examination of the New Testament books themselves than does that of Salmon; in accordance with this difference, the former develops internal evidence, the latter external evidence more prominently. This remark should not be understood as intimating defective treatment of his themes by either scholar, but only as pointing out a certain difference in emphasis, and, perhaps, of plan. In the matters of chief interest and importance these critics are found to be in substantial agreement. Both reach what I may call conservative results regarding the authorship and historic trustworthiness of our New Testament books. The student feels, however, that the spirit and, to some extent, the processes of the two scholars are quite different. Both are candid and scientific, but it would be too much to affirm that both are equally free from that bias respecting critical questions which doctrinal views inevitably tend to awaken. Dr. Salmon remarks in his preface that "it would be idle in any one to pretend that he can wholly divest himself of bias" (p. v.)—a just and true observation. In such inquiries the practical question is not between the existence and the entire absence of bias, but between degrees and kinds of bias. We cannot question the author's perfect sincerity when he affirms: "I can honestly say that I have not worked in the spirit of an advocate anxious to defend a foregone conclusion. I have aimed at making my investigations historical, and at asserting nothing but what the evidence, candidly weighed, seemed to warrant" (p. v.). An author may observe the principle here set forth most conscientiously, and yet introduce considerations in evidence which are entitled to weight only on certain assumptions. We think that few who should compare the works of Salmon and Weiss would fail to receive the impression that the former has not escaped at least the *appearance* of allowing weight to antecedent assumptions as constituting or reinforcing evidence, in the degree in which the latter has done so.

But we will not pursue the comparison further. We turn to an examination of some of Dr. Salmon's most important results. There are certain topics and problems in New Testament criticism which have excited, in recent times, so great interest that we are instinctively curious to know the views regarding them of every writer who gives his opinions to the world. I can do no better than to give the reader a brief account of Dr. Salmon's conclusions upon a few such questions.

On the question of the relative priority of the Synoptics, Dr. Salmon declares no confident opinion. He does not think that Matthew and Luke used Mark, but that all drew from some common source which is most fully and exactly represented by Mark. From this it does not follow that Mark is the earliest; he may even have written last. On these points he differs from the general consensus of opinion among critics, most of whom suppose Mark's Gospel to be the earliest, and to have been in the hands of the other evangelists.

In a somewhat extended note (pp. 158–64) our author discusses the genuineness of the last twelve verses of Mark, and concludes that the supposition that they were written by the evangelist himself is as reasonable as the contrary view, and that the burden of proof resting upon the objector is too heavy for him to bear. The verbal peculiarities of this passage, when compared with the Gospel of Mark, Dr. Salmon does not appear to have considered.

Our author stands in sharp contrast to Weiss in regard to the position taken upon the problem of the origin of the first Gospel. The latter holds, on the basis of the well-known patristic tradition dating back to Papias, that our first Gospel was first composed in late Hebrew (Aramaic) by the Apostle Matthew, and was subsequently wrought over, with additions, into Greek by another hand. Salmon differs with all this to the extent of contesting the correctness of the tradition itself upon which the theory is based. In brief, he presents two objections: (1) Our present Matthew bears evidence of being an original writing and not a translation; (2) no Greek text of that Gospel is known in antiquity except that which we have. Dr. Salmon thinks that Papias and the other witnesses to an Aramaic Matthew must have been mistaken, and have confused Matthew's work with some extra-canonical Hebrew Gospel. This thesis is supported by ingenuity and learning, but many readers will feel that there is throughout the author's argument a very keen interest in the conclusion, and that the evidence of tradition, which is sometimes set aside, is, in a strictly historic inquiry, more weighty than that which is adduced to establish the result.

Upon the much-disputed questions which concern the Apocalypse Salmon holds to the earlier date (68 or 69) which is now commonly assigned to the book, but doubts whether "the beast" of the vision was Nero, and questions whether the meaning of the mystic number 666 (ch. 13 : 18), which is usually regarded as either designating "Nero" or at least the Roman power in some form (p. 247), is yet understood.

Dr. Salmon holds that Paul was not the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and agrees with Weiss that the most plausible conjecture as to the author is that he was Barnabas. He thinks that, as a companion of the Apostle Paul, Barnabas would possess the Pauline training which is evidenced in the epistle, while, as a Levite of Cyprus (Acts 4 : 36), he would have, at once, that knowledge of the Levitical system and that acquaintance with Alexandrian thought which clearly must have been in possession of the writer.

In regard to the "Brethren of the Lord," among whom the writers of the Epistles of James and Jude are included, Salmon holds the so-called Epiphanian opinion, which maintains that they were sons of Joseph by a former marriage, as against the later views of Helvidius (that they were sons of Joseph and Mary) and of Jerome (that they were really the cousins of Jesus). When scholars are so generally agreed, as is now the case, that the second of these three views is the correct one, it is a matter of interest to see the oldest view of all supported by such experts as Salmon and Lightfoot. Our author favors the earlier date of the Epistle of James, and combats the view, so confidently put forward in recent times, that it was written to correct or supplement the teaching of Paul. The nature of his argument is well illustrated in this pointed statement: "James is not writing in the interests of Judaism, but of morality" (p. 505).

Our author recognizes an interdependence between Jude and 2 Peter, and holds the more common opinion that the latter is dependent upon the former. He conducts a vigorous and elaborate defence of the genuineness of 2 Peter.

The fourth edition presents few material changes. Some valuable additions for the critical student have, indeed, been made, but they relate to recondite themes. The book has been reduced in size by being printed in smaller type than was used for the earlier editions, and by the use of lighter paper. The loss of the large print is more than compensated for by the greater convenience of the volume in its present form.

These brief notices give a very inadequate idea of the scope and richness of the volume before us. In these twenty-five lectures the author has embodied a wealth of learning which entitles his work to take rank along with the productions of Bleek, Holtzmann, Weiss, and Davidson in the same field, and by his clear and elaborate arguments on themes of the greatest importance to the Christian Church, has made all earnest students of the New Testament Scriptures his debtor.

George B. Stevens.

Yale University.

A Treatise of Dogmatic Theology. By the Rev. Samuel Buel, S.T.D., etc. In two volumes. New York: T. Whittaker, 1890. Pp. viii., 513–700, 8vo, $6.00.

These portly volumes were published on conditions which render criticism superfluous. Their high worth is guaranteed beforehand by a number of clergymen whose opinions will far outweigh that of a single reviewer. The reviewer's praise is needless; his honest criticism is silenced. This mode of publication is in the highest degree unfortunate for the literary or theological reputation of Dr. Samuel Buel, because this, his greatest work, will not be judged on its own merits. Among those who seem to vouch for the high value of his "Treatise" are, for instance, Dr. Morgan Dix and Dr. E. Winchester Donald. Unless all popular estimates are wholly delusive, it may safely be affirmed that no possible treatise on *dogmatic theology* could really—or even at all nearly—satisfy *both* of these distinguished clergymen. I shall therefore attempt no review or criticism. It was a very graceful act on the part of those who asked the publication of these lectures, to show in that particular way their appreciation of one who had served the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church for nearly twenty years. Nearly twenty years ago that kind of service was a heroic self-sacrifice; even now the wealthy members of the richest Church in the United States are content to leave the training of the clergy almost to luck; and the salaries of professors are still little better than an insult.

These two volumes "fairly represent," in his own judgment, "the character of the work done by [Dr. Buel] in the service of the Church." I cannot review them, but I may venture to say that they are a kind of landmark—a landmark in all sorts of ways, even in style. Here, for instance, is a single sentence consisting of about two hundred and fifty words, constructed in the old periodic style, with clause within clause, to be matched in no possible literature of this present year. I say nothing about *the matter* of the sentence, except to hint my surprise that it can be supposed to throw any *clear light* on the mystery of Eucharistic Consecration. Here it is, and let him that readeth understand.

"[The bread] is, so blessed, taken and eaten, no longer mere or common bread, though in its material substance it is that and that alone; but it is now no longer simply what nature formed it; it is bread which has upon it the power of Divine benediction, and of the Spirit of Christ who has stamped upon it that benediction; it is therefore supersubstantial bread; that is, it has upon it, and in it, penetrating its whole substance, while that substance remains unchanged, the infusion of a Divine essence, of the Divine Spirit, by virtue of which, to those who in faith take and eat it as Christ appointed and commanded, it is the sacramental, spiritual body of Christ, as it was sacrificed for us, and as it ever exists in its sacrificial power and life; so that those who receive in faith this consecrated bread, this His sacramental body, through which a Divine essence or quality is infused by the Spirit of Christ, so that to them who so receive, take and eat it, it is the very sacrificed body, in its Divine power and efficacy unto life and salvation, of the ever-living Lord Himself, who ever liveth to make, in His intercession, in His presentation of that body in its own bodily substance in the Heaven of heavens, that body not here bodily present, the very possession in efficacy, force and virtue, in most deep and true reality, of His faithful disciples, as they receive His holy sacramental body."

To pass from style to matter, I would suggest the careful reading of Chapter XXIV. (ii., 422–50) on "Sufficiency and Inspiration of Holy Scripture," as a landmark. Nobody whose learning today is equivalent to Dr. Buel's learning twenty years ago could possibly have written that chapter It has not a trace of the "higher criticism." It naturally and inevitably does not so much as touch the controversies of to-day. Take this example:

"Again in Gal. iii. 16 St. Paul argues closely from a word: 'Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.' So does St. Paul apply the prophecies Gen. xvii. 8, xviii. 13, xxii. 18, xxvi. 4, to Christ. Here the liberty allowed to the human organ and the truth assured by the Divine inspirer are both illustrated. The reasoning of St. Paul in the passage is not unimpeachable by the test of logic. He *assumes* the collective Hebrew word [. . .] to signify an individual son, though that is not its necessary meaning. It more usually has a collective meaning—offspring, descendants.

"But the intention of the prophecy, in this instance, centred in the single descendant of Abraham, Christ, and in those who are one in Him. The collective meaning of [the Hebrew word . . .] therefore and its reference to Christ as the uniting centre may be retained in the exposition of the apostle. The apostle therefore rightly assumes this to be its meaning in the prophetic passages; and from this constructs an argument to emphasize and present the Divine revelation. But without the guidance of inspiration, without the assurance of the inspiring Spirit that such was the intended meaning of [the Hebrew word . . .] in the prophetic passages, on mere human reasoning from the true meaning of the word, the argument would be wholly inconclusive."

In other words, St. Paul was informed by God Himself that the Old Testament writer had used the wrong word; and also he was informed by God Himself what the right word was or should have been. I do not *criticise* this opinion, I merely *quote* it, and I say that it is a landmark. It would be easy to give many other and equally significant examples. It may be doubted whether a scholar could be found to-day who would maintain exactly this view of the effects of inspiration.

However, both criticism and commendation are here superfluous. These volumes are the request and the tribute of personal affection. They will remind Dr. Buel's many theological students of the pleasure and illumination they derived from his instruction. They are also his legacy to the students of the generation to come. Happy is the man who has won such high regard and deserves such respectful consideration.

W. KIRKUS.

BALTIMORE, MD.

JUDGES AND RUTH. By the Rev. ROBERT A. WATSON, M.A. New York: A. C. Armstrong. Pp. 424, 8vo, $1.50.

This is one of the "Bible Expositor" series. It has many excellencies. It is always orthodox. The lessons drawn are practical, and often urgent. It is modern in its allusions to the latest acquisitions of sacred learning. It makes due reference to the recent discoveries concerning the Hittites, and to the latest additions to monumental theology. Finally, it is expressed in very good if not very crisp and compact English. All these are certainly virtues. They go to make up a book abreast with the times.

Yet it must be admitted that it is not an ideal book even on its own lines. It is sometimes rather a paraphrase than an exposition, and in the paraphrase one misses the fine archaic directness of the original which is one of the chiefest charms of that antique history. There is an occasional lack of thoroughness of treatment, as in the sermon on Jephthah, for example, where no allusion is made to the real difficulties of interpretation, or to the manifold hypotheses as to the final fate of his luckless daughter, or the meaning of her errand to the mountains, while the practical lesson drawn seems to have no very close relevancy to the natural suggestions of the narrative. An occasional unscientific use of the imagination jars a little on one's sense of fitness. No doubt the imagination is essential in happy exposition. It is the power by which our best historians fill out missing details, rehabilitate the past, and pour into it all the passionate interest of a living present. But here that work is not always happily done, and sometimes the effect is as if one should restore the Parthenon, not by completing the broken lines left of Pheidias's work, but should fill them out with work which could never have been cut in a Pentelican quarry, or ever have gleamed under a Grecian sky.

But all this is not to say that this book is lacking in ability or utility. Its chapters were evidently originally delivered as sermons in the course of ordinary parish ministrations, and still bear the marks and qualities of their origin. Perhaps that makes it more likely to be useful to the lay than to the ministerial reader. The latter, coming upon it in his search of a model of exposition, may perhaps get less from it than he expected.

MANCIUS H. HUTTON.

NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.

LA JEUNESSE DE CALVIN. Par Abel Lefranc. Paris, Fischbacher. 1888. Pages xvi., 229. 8vo. 10 fr.

This book, of which the first part first appeared in the pages of the Bulletin of the French Protestant Historical Society, makes a substantial contribution to our knowledge of the early years of the future reformer of Geneva, and of the fortunes of Protestantism in the little city of the province of Isle de France, where he was born. The author has made a faithful use of the new material furnished, especially by the monumental collection of Calvin's works, published as the result of the long and patient researches of Professors Baum, Cunitz, and Reuss. More than this, he has gone carefully through the musty pages of the registers of the deliberations of the city of Noyon, a source of trustworthy information quite unexplored by any previous inquirer. Other municipal records have also been made use of, and have yielded some valuable data. The capitulary registers, or records of the chapter of the cathedral, have been lost, but M. Lefranc has been able by means of a very complete summary of their contents, preserved in the National Library of France, to ascertain some important facts.

Among the chief points established is, in the first place, the fact that the family to which Calvin belonged was one that enjoyed good social standing and no little influence in Noyon and its vicinity. By industry and integrity Gérard Cauvin had so advanced himself as to obtain important positions in connection with the chapter and to be able to secure for his sons benefices, chiefly valued by him and by them as affording the means of the prosecution of their studies at the most famous seats of learning in the land. His sons associated on terms of social equality with the best noble families of the region. John Calvin himself studied with the children of the Seigneur de Montmor, and when the latter resolved to send his sons to attend lectures in Paris, Gérard Cauvin availed himself of the opportunity of sending his own son in their company. But the story that the boy went at the expense of his rich friend is an entire mistake. Calvin was at no time an impecunious or a charity student.

A second point which is very clearly brought out is that the future reformer, far from being a recluse, repelling others by his austerity and himself avoiding the society of his equals in age, was on the contrary a great favorite with his companions, who, if they stood in admiration at his wonderful capacity for study, were powerfully drawn to him by the magnetism of his personal traits. His friendships were strong, intimate, and lasting. And this, despite the fact that being himself punctiliously exact in fulfilling the demands of the social etiquette, he sometimes appeared to his friends a little unreasonable in expecting an equal degree of care on the part of others.

M. Lefranc corroborates the opinion of Herminjard and others, that the beginning of Calvin's labors as a reformer has traditionally been placed several years too early. The death of his father, it is now found from the summary of the capitulary records, took place not in 1528, but in May, 1531; and this event exercised a decisive effect upon the son's course. It is not, in fact, until 1534 that Calvin appears as a decided Protestant. His letter to Martin Bucer, in which for the first time the language is that of a zealous Christian whose heart is aglow in the work of the Lord, belongs undoubtedly to this year, and not to 1532, where Dr. Jules Bonnet, in his "Letters of John Calvin," placed it. Here M. Lefranc agrees with the conclusions to which Herminjard had come twenty years ago. The conversion of Calvin did not resemble that of Martin Luther. It was to all human appearance a more gradual process, accompanied by no striking outward demonstrations, and giving less evidence of a painful inner experience. The conclusions at which he arrived, Calvin reached by a calm and dispassionate examination; but he took no step backward. And it is interesting to find that the current view respecting his relation to the conversion of his family is undoubtedly erroneous. Calvin did not give them the first impulse toward Protestantism; rather he received that impulse from his own kinsmen. Nor is it uncertain to whose words and example he was indebted for the knowledge of a pure Christianity. Pierre Robert, better known by his pseudonym of Olivetanus, the first Protestant translator of the Holy Scriptures, was not only Calvin's fellow-townsman but his cousin; and it was he, and not Melchior Wolmar, of Bourges, who was the chief instrument of Calvin's conversion. Moreover, his father and at least one of his brothers had a strong bias toward the reformed doctrines before John Calvin himself gave any signs of favoring the "new doctrines," as they were called.

If Calvin was deliberate in accepting to its fullest extent the Protestant system of belief, it was only after mature reflection and with great reluctance that he made up his mind to exchange a life of scholarly ease for the toils and harassing cares of a preacher of that belief. He has been well styled "*Le réformateur malgré lui*"—"The reformer in spite of himself."

M. Lefranc has succeeded in throwing some new light on the difficult subject of the chronology of Calvin's life during the two or three years preceding the date of his establishment at Geneva. The last division of the book treats of the state of Protestantism in Noyon after Calvin's departure. Here there is perhaps more that is novel and unexpected than in any other part. Contrary to the usual belief that the reformed doctrines were almost immediately put down by persecution, M. Lefranc establishes by documentary evidence that those doctrines held their own for fully a generation. The higher classes were preponderatingly Protestant, and the favor with which even the royal officers viewed the reformation was in many cases scarcely disguised. On the other hand, the populace was still attached to Roman Catholicism, and was easily moved by the priests and monks. The cause of the former phenomenon is to be sought in the close intercourse maintained between Calvin and other Protestant refugees at Geneva with their old friends in Noyon. This state of things continued until the close of the first religious war (1563), after which the records of the city, previously so full of mention of Protestants and of inquisition into heresy, suddenly become entirely silent on the subject. The date is almost coincident with the death of Calvin, which occurred May 27th, 1564. M. Lefranc surmises that the cessation of Calvin's influence upon his fellow-believers in Noyon may have had much to do with this. We cannot say that he has here made the connection of events as clear as could be desired. His work is fortified by a considerable appendix containing a number of hitherto inedited documents.

HENRY M. BAIRD.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Allen, J. R. The Monumental History of the Early British Church. London: C. K. Soc., 1890, 12mo, 3s.

Amelineau. Histoire du patriarche copte Isaac, étude critique (texte et traduction). Paris : Leroux, 1890. Pp. xxxvii., 84, 8vo.

Amiaud, A. La Legende syriaque de Saint Alexis, l'homme de Dieu. Chartres : Durand. Pp. lxxxv., 106, 8vo.

Barron, L. La Raison et la Foi. Solutions des deux grands problèmes qui ont pour but de concilier la raison avec la raison et la raison avec la foi. Paris : Sauvaître, 1890. 1er et 2e fascicule, 5 fr.

Bender, J. De jure et ratione dominationis pontificum romanorum in terram gentemque veterum Prutenorum commentatio. Braunsberg : Huye, 1890. Pp. 11, 4to, 60 mk.

Bericht über die Verhandlungen des 1. evangelisch-socialen Kongresses, abgehalten zu Berlin vom 27–29 Mai, 1890. Berlin : Oberwinder, 1890. Pp. 175, 8vo, 2 mk.

Bible, A. F. Jesus and the Resurrection. London : 1890, 8vo, cloth, 3s.

Blackall, C. R., Rev., and **E. L.,** Mrs., Stories about Jesus, our Lord and Saviour : His Wonderful Words and Works. Philadelphia : Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. 272, 4to, cloth, $1.25.

Bonnet, J. Die Wichtigkeit der weiblichen Gemeindediakonie in der Kirchen unserer Tage. Stuttgart : Greiner, 1890. Pp. 29, 8vo, 40 pf.

Booth, C. O., D. D. Plain Theology for Plain People. Philadelphia : Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. 205, 12mo, cloth, 90 cts.

Bourassé, J. J. Histoire de Jésus-Christ d'après les évangiles et la tradition, expliquée à l'aide des monuments, de la description des lieux et de commentaires des écrivains ecclésiastiques. Tours : Mame, 1890. Pp. 367, 8vo.

Bournichon, J. L'Invasion musulmane en Afrique, suivie du Réveil de la foi chrétienne dans ces contrées et de la Croisade des noirs entreprise par S. E. le Cardinal Lavigerie, Archevêque d'Alger et de Carthage. Paris : Deslis, 1890. Pp. 352, 4to.

Brown, R. Outlines of Prophetic Truth : Viewed Practically and Experimentally in the Light of the Divine Word. (Second and concluding series.) From Redemption to the Final State. London : Partridge, 1890. Pp. 660, 8vo, 12s.

Brückner, W. Die chronologische Reihenfolge, in welchen die Briefe des Neuen Testaments verfasst sind, insofern dieselbe abzuleiten ist sowohl aus ihrer gegenseitigen Uebereinstimmung und gegenseitigen Verschiedenheit, als aus dem in den späteren Briefen gemachten Gebrauch von Worten und Citaten, die in den früheren vorkommen. Leipzig : Harrassowitz, 1890. Pp. xvii., 306, 8vo, 6 mk.

Brugsch, Heinr. Die Aegyptologie. Abriss der Entzifferungen und Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der aegyptischen Schrift, Sprache, und Alterthumskunde. 2 abth. Leipzig : Friedrich, 1890, 8vo, 14 mk.

Bückrucker, Karl, Dr. Die normal. Katechismen der christlichen Kirche. Nürnberg : Sebald, 1890. Pp. iv., 170, 8vo, 2 mk.

Büchner, L. Fremdes und Eignes aus dem geistigen Leben der Gegenwart. Leipzig : Spohr, 1890. Pp. iv., 397, 8vo, 7 mk.

Butterworth, Hezekiah, Rev. The Story of the Tunes. New York : Am. Tr. Soc., 1890. Pp. 257, 12mo, cloth, $1.75.

Carus, Paul. The Ethical Problem. Chicago : Open Court, 1890. Pp. xiii., 90, 12mo, paper, 50 cts.

Cassel, P. Harmageddon II. Das tausendjährige Reich. (Offenbarung, cap. xx.) Eine wissenschaftliche Abhandlung. Berlin : Haack, 1890. Pp. 43, 8vo, 1 mk.

Chittenden, E. P., Rev., A.M. The Pleroma. A Poem of the Christ. In two books of seven cantos each. Written in semi-dramatic form. New York : Putnams, 1890. Pp. xv., 347, 12mo, $2.50.

Clemen, Paul. Die Porträtdarstellungen Karl's des Grossen. Aachen : Cremer, 1890. Pp. viii., 233, 8vo.

Coconier, Marie Thomas. L'Ame humaine. Existence et nature. Paris : Perrin, 1890, 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Copner, Jos. The Faith of a Realist. London : —, 1890, 8vo, 7s.

Cornely, R. Commentarius in primam S. Pauli Epistolam ad Corinthos. 9.60 fr.

Crerar, Thomas, Rev. Proceedings and Debates of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, May, 1890. Edinburgh : Macniven, 1890. Pp. 278, 1s.

Dixon, A. C. The True and the False. ("The truth as it is in Jesus" and "a view of Roman Catholicism in the light of the Bible.") Baltimore : Wharton, 1890. Pp. ii., 173, 12mo, cloth, $1.

Douais, C. Saint Germer, évêque de Toulouse au VIe siècle. Examen critique de la vie. Nogent-le-Rotrou : Daupeley, 1890. Pp. 142, 8vo.

Ecclesiastical Politics in the Methodist Episcopal Church. A Symposium. New York, 1890. Pp. 95, 12mo.

Eickhoff, H. Das Neue Testament des Clemens Alexandrinus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons. Programm. Schleswig : Bergas, 1890. Pp. ii., 24.

Einfalt, J. M. Die biblische Geschichte des Alten Testaments in übersichtlichen Betrachtungen für Kirche, Schule, und Haus. 2 Hälfte, Samuel bis Makkabäer. Leipzig : Deichert, 1890. Pp. iv., 822, 8vo, 3.20 mk.; complete, 5.60 mk.

Ernault, Léon, Marbode, évêque de Rennes, sa vie et ses œuvres (1035–1123). Ouvrage posthume. Avec une préface et des notes de Émile Ernault et de Felix Robion. Rennes : Caillière, 1890. Pp. 265, 8vo.

Farrar, F. W., Rev., D.D. The Minor Prophets. London : —, 1890. Pp. 245, 8vo, 3s.

Feige, Hermann. Die Geschichte des Mar Abhdiso und seines Jüngers Mar Qardagh. Herausgegeben und übersetzt. Kiel : Haeseler, 1890. Pp. 60, 104, 8vo, $2.20.

Ficker, J. Die altchristlichen Museum des Laterans, untersucht und beschrieben. Leipzig : Seeman, 1890. Pp. iii., 211, 3 trg. und 2 Taf., 8vo, 6 mk.

Fischer, K. Glauben oder Wissen ? Eine Untersuchung über die menschliche Geisteseinheit auf biologische Grundlage. Gotha : Perthes, 1890. Pp. vii., 60, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Floeckner, Carl. Der Triumphgesang am Schilfmeer (Exod. xv.) ausgelegt und kritisch untersucht. Programm. Beuthen : Wylezol, 1890. Pp. 24, 4to.

Foster, W. The Subject Testament ; or, The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (references only), arranged according to subject. London : Simpkin, 1890. Pp. 80, 8vo, 1s.

Friedmann, M. Talmud Babba M'zia. I. Abschnitt, mit Commentar R. Sch. I. Zum Unterrichts-Gebrauche. Wien : Lippe, 1890. Pp. iv., 52, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Fuld, R. Aharon, Beth Aharon. Responsa atque adnotationes in plerosque talmudi babylonici tractatus, Aruch, Tischbi, Meturgeman, etc. Ediderunt filii auctoris. Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann, 1890. Pp. xv., 227, 4to, 6 mk.

Garnet, Lucy M. J. The Women of Turkey and their Folk-lore. With introductory chapters on the ethnography of Turkey, etc., by John S. Stuart-Glennie. The Christian Women. London : Nutt, 1890. Pp. xvi., 382, 8vo.

Gemeriah, Amos, Rev. Vampires of the Anglican Church. London : Digby, 1890. Pp. 84, 8vo, 1s.

Gerok, K. Die Psalmen. In Bibelstunden (in 24 Lieferungen). 1. Lieferung. Stuttgart : Krabbe, 1890. 1. Bd., pp. 1-64, 8vo, 50 pf.

Gladden, Washington. Burning Questions of the Life that is Now, and that which is to Come. New York : The Century Co., 1890. Pp. 248, 12mo.

Glasson, E. Les rapports du pouvoir spirituel et du pouvoir temporel au moyen âge. Paris : Pichon, 1890. Pp. 108, 8vo.

Gough, E. The Bible True from the Beginning. Vol. III. London : Kegan Paul, 1890. 8vo, 16s.

Harris, D. Fiske. Calvinism Contrary to God's Word and Man's Nature. Chicago : W. T. Pub. Ass., 1890. Pp. 419, 12mo.

Harris, J. R. Biblical Fragments from Mt. Sinai. 10s. 6d.

Headland, Emily. Brief Sketches of Church Missionary Society Missions, Designed to Provide Material for Missionary Addresses. With a preface by Eugene Stock. (In 3 parts.) Part I. London : Nisbet, 1890. Pp. 129, 8vo, 1s.

Hinds, J. I. D., Ph.D. What ? How ? Why ? Whither ? Outline of a series of lectures delivered during the encampment of the Missouri Sunday-School Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, held at Pertle Springs, Mo., Aug., 1890. Nashville: Cumb. Presb. Pub. Pp. 54, 12mo, 25 cts.

Honef, Mart., Dr. Der Selbstmord Luthers, geschichtlich erwiesen. München: Liebfrauen, 1890. Pp. 94, 12mo, 80 pf.

Hunter, P. Hay. After the Exile: A Hundred Years of Jewish History and Literature. Part II. The Coming of Ezra to the Samaritan Schism. Edinburgh and London: Oliphant, 1890. 8vo, cloth, 5s.

Jebb, R. C. Erasmus: The Rede Lecture, delivered in the Senate House, June 11, 1890. Cambridge Warehouse, 1890. Pp. 54, 12mo, 1s.

Jewett, E. H., Rev., D.D. Diabolology: The Person and Kingdom of Satan. (Bishop Paddock Lectures, 1889.) London: Dickinson, 8vo, 4s. 6d.

Kingdon, Hollingworth Tully, Rt. Rev., D.D. God Incarnate. (Being the Paddock Lectures for 1890.) New York: Whittaker, 1890. Pp. 252, 8vo, cloth, $1.75.

Klotz, M. Der talmudische Tractat Ebel rabbathi od S'machoth, nach Handschriften und Parallelstellen bearbeitet und übersetzt. Königsberg: Koch, 1890. Pp. iv., 79, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Kolde, Th., Prof. Dr. Noch einmal Luther's Selbstmord. Erwiderung auf Majunke's neueste Schrift. Leipzig: Deichert, 1890. Pp. 28, 8vo, 50 pf.

Krauss, S. Volksglaube und religiöser Brauch der Südslaven. (Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der nichtchristlichen Religionsgeschichte. II. Bd.) Munster: Aschendorff, 1890. Pp. xvi., 176, 8vo, 3 mk.; I. and II. Bd., 5.75 mk.

Lellyett, J. Letters to Goliath of Gas, Better Known in Modern Times as Robert G. Ingersoll, having Special Reference to the Letters of Dr. Field and Col. Ingersoll, Published in the North American Review in the Years 1887–88. Nashville, Tenn.: So. Meth. Pub. Co., 1890. Pp. ii., 155, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Lobstein, P. Études christologiques. Le Dogme de la naissance miraculeuse du Christ. Paris: Fischbacker, 1890. 8vo, 1.25 fr.

Loeck, G. Die Homiliensammlung des Paulus Diakonus, die unmittelbare Vorlage des Otfridischen Evangelienbuchs. Leipzig: Fock, 1890. Pp. 47, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

McConnell, S. D., Rev, D.D. History of the American Episcopal Church. New York: Whittaker, 1890. Pp. 392, cloth, $2.

McGregor, E. R., Rev., A.M. Patmos. The History of the Kingdom of Heaven, The True Church of Christ. St. Louis: Burns Book Co., 1890. Pp. 263, 12mo.

Mackonochie, Alexander Heriot. A Memoir by E. A. S., edited by Rev. Edward Francis Russell. New York: Young, 1890. Pp. 332, 8vo, cloth, $2.

Magnus, Katie. Outlines of Jewish History from B.C. 586 to 1890; revised by M. Friedländer. Philadelphia: Jew. Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. xiv., 388, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Maltzew, A. Die göttlichen Liturgien unserer heiligen Väter Johannes Chrysostomus, Basilios des Grossen, und Gregorios Dialogos. Deutsch und Slawisch unter Berücksichtung der griechischen Urtexte. Berlin: Siegismund, 1890. Pp. xxxiv., 568, 8vo, 6 mk.

Manitius, M. Beiträge zur Geschichte frühchristlichen Dichter im Mittelalter, II. Leipzig: Freytag, 1890, 60 mk.

Meschler, M., S. J. Das Leben unseres Herrn Jesu Christi, des Sohnes Gottes, in Betrachtungen. 2 Bd. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1890. Pp. vii., 528, 8vo, 3.20 mk.; 2 Bde., 6.80 mk.

Metropolitan Church and Choir Directory of New York, Brooklyn and Adjacent Cities. Containing the names with the addresses of the clergyman and professional musicians associated with each church, also Sabbath school superintendents and sextons, 1890–91. New York: Metropol. Printing & Pub. Co., 1890. Pp. 369, 12mo, $1.50.

Meyer, F. B., Rev., B.A. Christian Living. New York: Revell, 1890. Pp. 160, 12mo, 50 cts.

Missionary Controversy: Discussion, Evidence and Report, 1890. London: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, 1890. Pp. 386, 8vo. 2s.

Munk, E. Des Samaritaners Marqah Erzählung über den Tod Moses. Königsberg i. Pr.: Koch, 1890. Pp. 62, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Neri, Philip, Maxims and Counsels of—. Dublin: Gill, 1890. Pp. 128, 32mo, 1s.

Pac de Bellegarde, G. du. Coup d'oeil sur l'ancienne église catholique de Hollande, et récit de ce qu'on a fait, sous Clément XIV, pour concilier cette église avec la cour de Rome. Publié d'après les manuscrits inédits avec quelques annotations par Rich. J. Hoogkaas. La Haye: Nijhoff, 1890. Pp. iv., 59, 8vo, 0.60 fr.

Reid, H. L. The Story of a Heathen and his Transformation. Boston and Chicago: Cong. S. S. & Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. 82, 12mo, 60 cts.

Schneider, Ceslaus M., Dr. Das apostolische Jahrhundert, als Grundlage der Dogmengeschichte dargestellt. II. Bd., 3. abth. (Ergänzungsheft zu "St. Thomasblätter.") Regensburg: Verlags-Anstalt, 1890. Pp. 417–624, 2.40 mk.; complete, 17.80 mk.

Schröder, A. Entwicklung des Archdiaconats bis zum 11 Jahrhunderte. München: Kranzfelder, 1890. Pp. viii., 124, 8vo, 1.80 mk.

Schuler, G. M. Der Materialismus gewürdigt durch Darlegung und Widerlegung. Berlin: Germania, 1890. Pp. 295, 8vo, 3 mk.

Scott, Chas. Anderson, B.A. The Life of Abraham. (Bible Class Primers. Edited by Prof. Salmond, Aberdeen.) New York: Scribner & W., 1890. Pp. viii., 84, 16mo, 25 cts.

Serullaz. Droit romain: essai sur la religion romaine et sur les rapports de l'état romain avec quelques religions étrangères. Lyon: Pitrat, 1890. Pp. 438, 8vo.

Sofer, L., Rabbi. Jalkut Eliezer. Lexicon der in den Talmuden, Midraschim, und in der älteren rabbinischen Literatur enthaltenen aggaeischen Exegesen zu den Psalmen, mit Glossen und Anmerkungen versehen und herausgegeben. Paks. Wien: Lippe. Pp. iv., 319, 8vo, 3.40 mk.

Stead, William T. The Passion Play as it is Played To-day at Ober-Ammergau in 1890. German and English text in parallel columns. Copiously illustrated, etc. New York: Merrill, 1890. Pp. viii., 130, 8vo.

Steinmeyer, F. L. Beiträge zum Verständniss des Johanneischen Evangeliums. Bd. V. (Inhalt: Die Heilung der Blindgeborenen durch Jesum.) Berlin: Wiegandt, 1890. Pp. vi., 112, 8vo, 1.80 mk.; Bde. I.–V., 9.85 mk.

Stevenson, R. L. Father Damien: An Open Letter to the Rev. Dr. Hyde, of Honolulu. Reprinted from the Scots Observer. London: Chatto, 1890. Pp. 26, 8vo, 1s.

Thompson, Hugh Miller, Rt Rev., D.D. The World and the Man. (The Baldwin Lectures for 1890.) New York: Whittaker, 1890. Pp. 258, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Trochon, C. et Lesetre. Introduction à l'étude de l'écriture sainte d'après la "sainte Bible," avec "Commentaires," Tom. 2: Introductions particulières aux livres de l'Ancien Testament. Paris: Lethielleux, 1890. Pp. 664, 8vo.

Vittam, Edmond March. Faith on the Frontier. Boston and Chicago: Cong. S. S. & Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. 399, 12mo, $1.50.

Votsch, Dr. Ulrich von Hutten, nach seinen Leben und seinen Schriften geschildert. Hannover: Hahn, 1890. Pp. x., 75, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Wagner. Ueber das Verhältniss des Natürlichen zum Gottlichen im Alten Testament. Programm. Sondershausen: Eufel, 1890. Pp. 20, 4to.

Weidner, R. F. Studies in the Book. Third series, containing studies on the later epistles of St. Paul, including Colossians, Ephesians, Philemon, Philippians, Hebrews, 1 Timothy, Titus and 2 Timothy. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 105, 12mo, cloth, $1.

Weissmann, A. S. Das Buch Judith historischkritisch beleuchtet. Wien: Lippe, 1890. Pp. 28, 8vo, 80 pf.

Wilson, J. The Origin of Scripture on its Divine and Human Sides. A contribution to the present biblical discussion. Edinburgh: Macniven, 1890. Pp. 50, 8vo, 1s.

Winter, F. J. Gregorius von Nazianz, Ausgewählte Reden. Mit einer Einleitung Monographie in Deutscher Uebersetzung. (Die Predigt der Kirche, 10 Bd.) Leipzig: Richter, 1890. Pp. xix., 154, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Wright, William, LL.D. Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. From the papers of the late—. New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. xi., 288, 8vo, $3.50.

Wyclif, Johannis. Sermones, now first edited from the manuscripts, with critical and historical notes by Johann Loserth. (Engl. side-notes by F. D. Matthew.) Vol. IV. Sermones Miscellanei. London: Trübner, 1890. Pp. xvi., 530, 8vo.

Zeller, Alwin. Das Pferd, der Esel, und der Hund in der heiligen Schrift. Ein Beitrag zur biblischen Archäologie. Programm. Plauen i. V.: 1890. Pp. 30, 4to.

Zerbolt van Zütphen, Gerhard. Het tractaat "De pretiosus Vestibus" medegedeeld door D. J. M. Wüstenhoff. Gent: Engelcke, 1890. Pp. 48, 8vo, 1 mk.

NOTICES OF MAGAZINES.

HARPER'S for October is, as usual, rich in illustrations and letter-press. Mr. Theodore Child transports us by pen and pencil to Chili. We gaze upon its railways, its fertile fields, and its rural towns, and visit its cities, but the stress of the article is upon the farming resources of Chili and its methods of cultivation. Mr. L. E. Chittenden contributes a valuable article on the monetary history of Lincoln's administration. Professor J. S. Newberry tells the story of the birth of a great industry—viz., petroleum. Mr. Joaquin Miller relates the story of some nights in the haunted room at Newstead Abbey, in Sherwood Forest, where Robin Hood led his men. Mr. Julian Ralph tells how he hunted moose in the wilds of Canada. Mr. George Ticknor Curtis gives his personal recollection of N. P. Willis and Lydia Maria Child; while Mr. George William Curtis brings out, in his uniformly admirable style, the sad contrast between Christ and the external forms of his religion; between the lofty ideals of the Founder and the despicable failures of the disciples. Besides these articles there is the continuation of "Port Tarascon," and other contributions in prose and verse which go to make up an excellent number.

SCRIBNER'S for October has a good table of contents. Mr. Herbert Laws Webb, a member of the technical staff of the Silvertown Telegraph Company's steamer, which laid the cable from Spain to the Canary Islands, tells about "Life on Board a Cable Ship." Mr. John W. Root writes on the "City House in the West," in the course of which he prophesies great things for the Western cities in the way of handsome streets. Mr. Root's position as an architect entitles him to speak with authority. He is the architect of the great business block in Chicago known as "The Rookery." Mr. Rufus F. Zogbaum describes harbor life as seen from an American man-of-war in the ports of Lisbon, Gibraltar, Tangiers, and Port Mahon. The illustrations are all from his drawings. Rev. Dr. Newman Smyth has a richly illustrated and enthusiastic article on the Maine woods. The "Sand-waves at Henlopen and Hatteras" give Mr. John R. Spears his congenial theme. He declares that at no distant day the inhabitants of Cape Hatteras will be compelled by the tidal wave of sand to leave their present position. Mrs. Sylvanus Reed, long at the head of a famous girl school in New York City, has something to say respecting female education.

THOSE ministers and other good people who look longingly upon the forbidden country, Stageland, should read for their consolation Mr. Edward Fuller's sharp arraignment of theatrical audiences in the October number of LIPPINCOTT'S. In "The Public and the Stage" he scores them for their lack of taste and preference for low buffoonery and horse-play. He declares that the present state of the drama is low because the public want nothing better! This seems hard, but it is apparently borne out by the facts. Professor Sydney T. Skidmore, in the same magazine, contributes an able and thoughtful article upon "University Extension." He argues that a course of study should be arranged to cover "ten or twenty years' or a life-time, according to individual time or opportunity. . . . . The hours of instruction and study must be taken from those not demanded for business or toil. The general diploma must be made attainable in parts grade by grade and branch by branch, instead of a whole, as now." The idea is a good one, and should attract the attention of all interested in educational matters. Mr. L. R. McCabe will surprise many by what he has to say about "Le Prix de Rome," the prize annually offered by the French Government to the best painter, sculptor, architect, engraver and musician, under thirty years of age, competing annually in their respective lines. The winners are sent to Rome for further study and supported there for four years. Mr. McCabe describes their life in the Villa Médicis, which is quite ideal. The government and people get a rich return on the investment in the stimulus the competition for so great a prize necessarily causes. It were better for us to have such a prize established than to squander the taxes of honest toil upon the horde who demand pensions. But just at present there is small evidence of such wisdom. Miss M. Helen Lovett points out "Some of the Fallacies of the Woman Suffragists," and Miss Rose Elizabeth Cleveland writes upon Florida as a resort for the sick and well. Her affection for the beautiful State comes out in the very title of the article, "My Florida." She is particularly well acquainted with Southern Florida. Sir David Salomons, the eminent English scientist, writes upon "Electric Lighting," and also upon electric motors, two topics upon which much remains to be said, and indeed to be known But most readers will turn at once to W. Clark Russell's complete story, "A Marriage at Sea." Mr. Russell's stories are uniformly healthy in tone and matter Besides the articles thuse enumerated are others—fiction and poetry, and then come the usual editorial departments.

THE CENTURY for October opens with a frontispiece portrait of Joseph Jefferson, who concludes his autobiography, and appends his final reflections upon his art. Rev. Dr. Edward Eggleston writes on "Out of the Ways in High Savoy." Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, who desires fame as the author of the Force Bill, writes with power upon "Why Patronage in Office is un-American." He does well to present this side of the reform, for in some mysterious way the present system of patronage, with its inevitable failures and its rancors, has been believed to be genuinely democratic, and therefore American, whereas it is essentially aristocratic and foreign. Mr. Lodge is well employed in doing his utmost, through the press and in Congress, to facilitate the widest extension of civil service reform. Professor G H. Darwin, the son of Charles Darwin, writes "On Meteorites and the History of Stellar Systems;" Mr. John La Farge continues his "Artist's Letters from Japan;" Mrs. Amelia Gere Mason her papers on the "Women of the French Salons," and Mrs. Amelia E. Barr concludes her novel, "Friend Olivia." Mr. F. T. Bickford, in an illustrated article, treats of the "Prehistoric Cave-dwellings;" Lieutenant W. H. Shelton tells the thrilling story of his escape from a Southern prison during the war; Miss Helen Gray Cone has a congenial theme in "Woman in American Literature;" Miss Sarah Orne Jewett has a story, "In Dark New England Days," and the "Topics of the Time," "Open Letters" and "Bric-à-brac' conclude the number.

THE COSMOPOLITAN for October, like its predecessors, presents an attractive appearance and has its accustomed variety. It cannot be ranked among the most thoughtful journals of the country, but then it is surely among the most entertaining. The only serious criticism of its plan is that it admits of matter in which gossip verges upon impropriety. The October number has this table of contents: "The Executive Departments of the Government" (illustrated), by George Grantham Bain; "Change" (a poem), by Mary Lowe Dickinson; "A Brabantian Happening" (illustrated), by George Wharton Edwards; "A Prophecy" (poem), by Helen T. Clark; "A Flying Trip Around the World" (illustrated), by Elizabeth Bisland; "Norsemen in the United States" (illustrated), by Kristopher Janson; "A Glimpse of Guatemala" (illustrated), by Francis J. A. Darr; "Solitude" (a poem), by Frederick Peterson; "Horses and Riders," by Henry Cabot Lodge; "A Successful Man" (story, illustrated), by Julien Gordon (Mrs. Kruger); "A Sea Charge" (poem), by Esther Singleton; "A Piscatorial Dinner" (illustrated), by Charles Pelham-Clinton; "Francisque Sarcey" (illustrated), by Brander Matthews; "Miss Devilet" (story, illustrated), by Macdougall Buel; "A Vision of Eld" (poem), by James B. Kenyon; "The Twin Cities of the Northwest" (illustrated), by Charles King; "Rose and Edelweiss" (poem), by H. T. Sudduth; "Review of Current Events," by Murat Halstead; "Social Problems," by Edward Everett Hale; "John Boyle O'Reilly" (portrait), by James Jeffrey Roche. Some of these articles call for more extended notice here. It was a good idea to introduce us to the Norsemen, who make a large part of our population, and a better part than we sometimes remember. The article is very interesting. On p. 684 the author's portrait appears, and on p. 682 we are informed that he is a "Norwegian author and theologian," and the head of the Unitarian movement among his countrymen. Captain King, in a lively article, endeavors to hold the scales of praise evenly between the twin cities of Minnesota. The result is fairly successful. He writes with great enthusiasm and gives much information. To change the subject, take a piscatorial dinner with Mr. Pelham-Clinton. To eat whitebait at Greenwich is the correct thing, and it is surely an excellent sea-food, as all who have tried it will testify. Or you may take a glimpse at Guatemala—it is not a nice country, nor even a safe one to live in. Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge appears in the rôle of instructor in horseback riding. His article merits the attention of all who ride or try to. It gives valuable hints in simple, clear language. The "Brabantian Happening" is an interesting tale of thwarted antiquarian zeal.

THE ATLANTIC for October is excellent. It is good literature. Of the articles, that on a wandering scholar of the sixteenth century (Piemontanus) is the freshest, but where all is so good it is difficult to make a selection. Yet worthy of special commendation are Mr. Palmer's translation from the Odyssey and Mr. Fiske's account of Benedict Arnold's treason.

THE
MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 3. NOVEMBER, 1890. No. 2.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

MINISTRY IN CITIES.

BY REV. EDWARD EVERETT HALE, D.D., BOSTON, MASS.

PAUL WENTWORTH, the spy, in one of his confidential communications to Eden, in 1776, said of the American colonies that in many of them there was never a pauper seen, and that many of them did not know what a poor-rate was. We have come bravely beyond that now. Yet there is no doubt that Wentworth's statement was then true. Indeed, he did not want to exaggerate on that side. Had he overstated, it would have been to the disparagement of the colonies. As States and as a nation, we have come bravely beyond the condition of Wentworth's Arcadia. But there are now, up and down in this country, communities of a considerable size of which the same thing could be said which he said of whole colonies. I have once and again visited county jails in Massachusetts where there was no prisoner. I remember the summer when it was seriously proposed to rent the poorhouse in Milton, Massachusetts, to summer boarders. They might easily have found worse quarters, for it was in an exquisite situation. Few of our readers will not recall places where the charity society of the Church, eager to be of use, has to send its contributions for the good of some city charity, simply because the town has no paupers of its own.

Speaking roughly, it is safe to say that the difficulty increases with the population of a village or town. There is more pauperism and there is more crime in a town of twenty thousand people than in a town of one thousand—and the excess goes far beyond the proportion which these figures indicate. In the town of a hundred thousand people, the number would have increased again over the ratio of the town of ten thousand.

In handling the difficulty thus presented, the Church of Christ has this disadvantage—that these large cities, rapidly gathered, are, on the whole, a modern invention, and that the Church has not a very large experience from which to select her best methods of attack in suppressing such an evil. All the same, the Church has this thing to do. She says that she represents Jesus Christ, and that he has power to take away the sins of the world. She says that his name was given him for this reason. Now, for a generation or so, when you say to the leaders of the Church, "Why do you not take away the sins of Boston, of New York, or of Scranton?" she may answer, in a puzzled way, "I am going to. I am setting to work on this. But I have not got ready. You must give me time."

Meanwhile, as I have said, the Church does point, with a just pride and complacency, to what she does and has done in small districts, where she could inspect the whole ground and could have her own way. John Frederic Oberlin knew how to administer his parish so that there were no paupers and no criminals there. My own grandfather, Enoch Hale, of Northampton, had the moral and spiritual oversight of a township in which lived six or seven hundred people. For those people he ministered. That means, in the world's language, he took the spiritual and moral care of them. He did this by going daily from district to district, from house to house. Literally he knew by sight and by name every person in that township. He advised, in every one of a hundred families, what should be done with that boy or this girl. As the result of such a supervision as that, there was again no criminal and no pauper. I have his diary for half a century, and I do not believe there are ten notices of crime in the whole parish. It was his business to take care of those people. And he took care of them.

I venture to say that ten years would pass without any person in that community of six or eight hundred people being brought before the courts to answer either for debt or for any crime. If there were any one in the poorhouse, it was some aged man or woman, or perhaps some aged couple, who could be better cared for in that central establishment, where "the town" in general could show its interest in them, than in their own separate and perhaps distant home.

Now I certainly do not mean that one man, by his own service, kept people thus from beggary or from crime. No. But he had behind him the backing of "the town." This means that all the intelligent and conscientious people in that town had confidence in his opinion in matters of destitution, temptation, or need, and were ready and willing to take a fair share in relieving the town from such dangers where they existed. I want to call attention to the fact that there was one person who surveyed the whole ground, and that it was not possible that the first steps should be taken toward crime or pauperism, but he observed them, and could call attention to them.

What followed was a condition of things in which poor-rates were unheard of and poor-laws unknown.

In our day we have no such state of things in our cities, and scarcely any remnant of such a condition in our country parishes. Indeed, the word "parish" has wholly lost its meaning. It is no longer a territorial expression. It means a company of worshippers who, with more or less definiteness, have united themselves in one religious society. To a certain oversight of this "parish" a clergyman is appointed, and he does what he can as the moral and spiritual adviser of these people. But their homes are scattered from King's Bridge, it may be, to Staten Island. And for the others, who, for whatever reason, have not united themselves with any religious society, there is no pretext of regular moral or spiritual oversight. The "mission chapels" in a city like New York are established with a certain hope of accomplishing something like what the country parson did, as matter of professional privilege and duty, for every one. But how little this is appears at once when we are told that the "Assembly Precinct," in which is the "Rivington Street Settlement," has five chapels only for fifty thousand people. It is a beginning, but only a beginning in the right direction. Now there is very little use in launching the bow of a ship alone. Unless you can launch the whole of her, you had better keep the bow on the stocks until you can.

Mr. W. H. McElroy, in an admirable parable which has been widely circulated, told how Rev. Matthew Middlemas approached this problem, and described the success which he and his condjutors attained. His plan was a loyal co-operation of all the churches in a town "to take away the sins of the world." By their cooperation the twelve churches in that town were able to achieve much more than twelve times what any one church could achieve alone. I believe that with the advance of Christianity some such plan will be worked out in the small cities or large towns of America. And the moment it is successfully carried out in one, that town will be the centre of the curious and grateful study of the Christian world.

The practical difficulty of that plan at this moment is, that hardly one of our churches is organized with a view to practical charity or helpfulness among the neighbors. There are good experiments in those directions. Such a church as St. George's, in New York City, or as the Barnard Memorial, in Boston, shows what can be done. But, on the whole, the organization of activity in our churches, of whatever communion, looks first to the quickening of the religious life of the worshippers; second, to the work of foreign missions; third, to the study of the theory of Christian philanthropy. Then the real, practical work of opening the eyes of the blind and the ears of the deaf, of clothing the naked and proclaiming glad tidings to the poor, is not undertaken by the Church as an organization, but is left to the intelligence and sensibility of individuals as they have been quickened by the energies thus set in order.

The charity organization societies do enough to show where the weak spot in our system is, but from the nature of their organization they do not fill the gap which they disclose. I do not myself believe that the gap will be filled till the Church of Christ devotes itself systematically to the business, and when it does, I think it will prove that its success is on the old lines, of personal oversight by consecrated men and women, carried out so far that every person in the district in hand may be under the direct personal and intelligent supervision of somebody. There shall be somebody to see when a boy or girl is led into temptation, and somebody to contrive how they may be delivered from evil.

I have in my mind one of the more crowded wards in the city of Boston, with a population, say, of twenty thousand people. In this ward are three churches, one synagogue, and close to it a strong post of the Salvation Army and another church. The five churches thus named are: one Roman Catholic, two Congregational, one a small Methodist chapel, and one Episcopal. They are attended mostly by worshippers from outside the ward. Thus the pastor of the Methodist Church told me that but thirty-seven families or individuals in the ward had any connection with his "parish." I think the five churches maintain ten ministers.

Besides these churches, there is an orphan asylum for ninety girls; there is a children's mission, and two or three local charities, which have more or less to do with the purpose we have in hand.

Now, under the old-fashioned system of ministry which I have been describing, at least twenty "ministers," if I may be permitted to use the word of the Bible and the Prayer-Book, instead of the more elegant "rector" or "pastor," would have the oversight of these twenty thousand people. What is important is, each man would know where his people were and who they were. Any working minister will agree with me that one thousand persons, or, speaking roughly, one hundred and thirty families, make the outside number for which any one man, with his wife, ought to feel himself in any sort responsible, when such supervision is discussed as we are speaking of.

Observe that in place of the twenty required there are, in fact, but ten, and they have much more than the charge of this district or ward given to them. Not one of these five churches but has two thirds as many "parishioners" from outside the ward than it has within it, and the same may be said of the Jewish synagogue. The present provision, then, of "ministry," in the old-fashioned use of the word, meets only a small proportion of the people of the ward, and for them the ministers in charge have but half the time and resource which, on my estimate of one minister for one thousand people, they demand.

I give this definite instance in such detail, because it is a great deal better to speak of an actual case than to describe imaginary successes in imaginary paradises. As it happens, also, I know personally something of the ward, for a part of it comes into District K, which is the section of Boston entrusted to the South Congregational Church, of which I am minister, by the plans of our Conference.

With this knowledge, after an experience of thirty-four years in work on this very territory, let me say what I would there do now if I were a bishop who thought he had any responsibility for the region, whether Catholic, Episcopalian, Methodist, or Congregationalist.

1. I would visit the Jewish rabbi, the Catholic clergy, the Episcopalian "rector," the Unitarian minister, the other Congregational minister, and the Methodist "pastor," as I observe he calls himself. I would say to them, "We propose to find out what is the moral and spiritual condition of this ward; we propose to keep the people in it out of temptation as well as we can, and to deliver them from evil as far as the good God will help us. For this purpose we are going to make a list of them, and to know who takes care of them. Will you give us a list of the families where you have any personal oversight which you wish to retain? For we have our hands full, and we do not want to interfere with anybody else."

2. They would give me these lists; and they would include about one sixth of the families of the ward. They would include very few of the floating population—young men and young women who are boarders in families or hire single rooms. For such people do not readily connect themselves with the formal religious organizations.

3. Roughly speaking, the ward contains 2500 households, averaging 7 persons each, 1500 single men and women living separately. Of these, possibly 300 households and 300 single men and women would prove to be regular "parishioners" of my 10 clergymen, and may be subtracted from those "we" have to provide for. And we must have one minister or overseer for each 120 families. For 2200 families and 1200 other persons we must provide about 20 more ministers than we have, if we mean to do this thing as thoroughly as it is done where men succeed in doing it. I mean that I would assign to each of these ministers 110 families or thereabouts, and 60 of the separate single persons.

4. I should proceed, not to appoint these twenty ministers, but to see that the right persons did appoint them.

I should not think I had half done my task when one half were appointed.

I should not think I had done a quarter

of it when one quarter of the number were appointed.

Indeed, if I could not launch the whole ship, I would not launch it at all.

5. I should proceed in some such way as this. I should hire a large old-fashioned house and place in it an intelligent old-fashioned Minister. He should be a man who had outgrown the boyish passion for preaching, and who knew the inestimable worth of ministry.

He should be a consecrated Christian man, able to bear his cross this morning, and willing to be crucified this afternoon—a man willing to make himself of no reputation, and who really believed that "whoever would be first among you should be your minister." He should have a wife like himself, and they two should live in this house, supervise our ministry to the ward, and make the house its cathedral or headquarters.

Into this house I should admit seven or eight younger men who were willing to do what they were told to do by the Chief of Staff, who is the minister above described. To them, according to the time they gave to this work, should be assigned a certain number of families, of whom they had the oversight, for whom they were the ministers.

In a somewhat similar establishment I should place, for their residence, seven or eight women, experienced in ministry, and willing to devote their lives to the service in hand.

We should thus be provided with fifteen or sixteen of the ministers needed. The other four or five would live in their own homes, having been selected for special service, as will appear.

6. The first business of the Chief of Staff thus engaged in the King's service would be to make, by his agents, an exact census of each of the houses and tenement-houses in his ward. It would give the name and age of every person, it would tell what school every child attended, what church satisfied the people who had "any religion to speak of."

He would assign to the ten ministers whom he had found at work in the ward the three hundred families and three hundred other "parishioners" whom they had named as now connected with their respective churches.

He would then go to the Catholic bishop of Boston, the Episcopal bishop, the Methodist bishop, the Moderator of the Suffolk Conference and the minister of the Berkley Street Church, and he would ask each of them to name a clergyman or visitor of his own communion to reside in the ward and be ready to administer the sacraments or give other religious advice and comfort needed in all cases which might require. We should thus have a special minister at hand, who would be ready to meet the special religious needs of those under our care. These five would live where they pleased, and would not be under the restrictions of our two houses. We should now have the twenty ministers whom the work of the ward requires.

To each of these men the Chief of Staff would assign 110 families and 60 single persons or thereabouts, grouped as closely together as possible. In that ward there are two or three tenement-houses which would alone make such a "parish." The man to whom such a group was assigned would regard it as his special business, or the woman who had such a group would regard that as hers. To get acquainted with these people would be the first object of their lives. They would succeed or fail according to their success in getting acquainted. They would find what schools the children attended, how the teachers liked them and rated them. They would find what clubs the men frequented. They would look in, with one or another errand, at their places of work. In any case of sickness or other distress they would be ready with any friendly offices. If they got chances, they would visit the people of their groups; but this, of course, would come only in time and with proper opportunity. They would study the arrests, the hospital entries, and the trials in court daily, to see if any of their charge were in trouble. Each would keep a careful record of his thousand sheep and lambs, and know, as often as once a week, where they were. The right people, with the right instinct for ministry, would get up their lists within a month's time of their appointments.

Before long they would have a just ambition and rivalry in keeping their lists white and strong. In proportion as they knew their boys and girls, would they be mortified that any one of those boys and girls was in arrest, or was drunk, or was turned out of school. When a boy left school and went to work, his own minister would know where he went and why he went there, would see that the bargain was fair, and that the boy had a chance. As boy or girl came to the age when children like to be out of evenings, and careless parents let them go, here would be somebody with an eye on the evening occupations and amusements of the neighborhood.

And here, counting in the resident clergy, already ten in number, would be a body of thirty people whose business in life would be to keep a moral and spiritual oversight of this ward. They would oversee what are called its "charities." They would interest themselves in measures for its higher education, for public amusements, for drainage and other sanitary arrangements. They would not be above interfering in its local politics. They would be able to present very strong reasons to the licensing board, if it were necessary, to refuse or to grant a license to a liquor-dealer. They would stand by each other in any public affair which needed pressure upon the community or upon the authorities. In a word, where it is now the business of every one of twelve hundred voters to take a twelve-hundredth part of the moral oversight of that ward, it would then be the business of a union of thirty people, acting with a common sense of duty, to see that that oversight was thoroughly carried on.

The Chief of Staff and the Lady Superior, as I will call them, who are the heads of the two houses, would have the general supervision of the work which I have tried to describe. I should suggest that as often as once a week all the "ministers" under their direction should be called together, with as many of the others as could come to such a meeting. I should suggest that the roll should then be called—first, of all persons who had died in the ward in the last week.

"Mr. Smith, James McCloskey died; what were the circumstances?

"Mrs. Jones, Bernard Baum died; what were the circumstances?

"Mr. Anders, Hans Andersen died; what were the circumstances?"

If these various deaths brought out any occasion of family distress, which it was not in the power of that special minister to relieve, that would be a case for the Chief of Staff to refer to higher and stronger authorities.

Next should come the record of the courts.

"Mrs. Oberlin, I see that a woman was sentenced to the Island for six months. She is one of your people. What are the circumstances?" And so on.

Third, would come the cases of removal from the ward, and perhaps the sending of a proper note of introduction to some person in the place to which they had removed.

Fourth, would come an inquiry as to the persons who had moved into the ward. For if this business were properly done, there would not be a stranger entering the ward to live but, before a week was over, his name would be properly registered on the registry of the Chief of Staff.

This is the way any business is administered which is carried on in a business-like way. This is the sort of care, for instance, which is taken of a corps in the army; it is the sort of oversight by which the work-people in a large factory are superintended; it is the same regimen which is applied in a great public school. I see no reason why the Church of Christ should not make it her pride to have a similar watchfulness over the people who have been entrusted to her charge. I do not think that this watchfulness is sufficiently maintained under our present sporadic system—in which, with infinite waste of time, each person takes up a special and separated case, without any confidence that he is supported by those who are on the right hand and on the left hand.

I have said nothing of the expense of carrying out such a system. I do not believe that the expense need stand in the way of it for a moment, if the system is the right system. The Church does not mean to be balked at home while she is carrying on her victories abroad. What she needs is to bestow the same care on her enterprises at home that she would bestow on her enterprises abroad.

A rough estimate of the expense of the plan I have supposed would be this:

Rent of the two houses which are the centres of work, say.....	$2,400 00
Salaries of the Chief of Staff and Lady Superior, say..........	5,000 00
Board and salary of 20 "ministers," men and women, at, say, $600 each annually......	12,000 00
	$19,400 00

For their charities, their hospital expenses, their medicines, their reading-rooms, their libraries, and the rest, they would rely on the well-organized charities of the city as they already exist.

I believe that, with such a system of supervision, the whole tone of this ward would be changed at once. I think that gradually the separate ministers would find they were able to report absolutely "clean lists" week by week—by which I mean lists on which there was no person who had died from hunger, or from drunkenness, or from neglect, and in which no person had appeared before the courts. There is many and many a parish minister who will read these lines who knows that from his own parish, in the last year, nobody has been sent to prison, nobody has starved, and nobody has died of negligence. I know no reason why, with the proper supervision, the same thing should not be said of such parishes as I am attempting to provide for, and as I have been trying to describe.

For The Magazine of Christian Literature.

THE IMPOTENCE AND THE RIGHT USE OF IMAGINATION IN DEALING WITH CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN STEINFORT KEDNEY, D.D., SEABURY DIVINITY SCHOOL, FARIBAULT, MINNESOTA.

In the article which follows I endeavor to point out the source of many of the untenable or incoherent views of Christian doctrine which have been hindrances in the way of advance in theologic science.

I give only a specimen, for to treat the topic exhaustively would require the composition of a treatise, which I may at some day undertake. There would thus be furnished another evidence that the solution of all problems, whether of physical science, psychology, or theology, depends upon the philosophy or ideal construction of the whole fabric of knowledge, which is implicit in the mind of one who attempts it. He who endeavors to build up his system upon exegetical or historic grounds solely is quite as much dominated by his philosophy as he who pursues any other method.

Imagination is commonly spoken or written of as the *representative* faculty—that which takes up the impressions derived through the senses, and which have become perceptions by falling into the moulds supplied by the understanding, and reproduces them in consciousness as accurately as possible, or recombines them into a new result having apparent unity, so as to present them thus to the mind for its work or its play.

The linking together the material supplied by memory, in a loose or arbitrary way, is sometimes called Fancy; while the unifying of this content so as to produce a self-consistent whole has been spoken of as the work of Imagination proper, thus distinguished. Both mental movements are partly spontaneous and partly deliberate. The passivity is only seeming. The activity is actual even in the most apparent spontaneity, and may consist in its lowest degree merely in the will's refraining from any interference with the play of association, and holding the mind steady during this riot of images. But a more manifestly wilful procedure is when the mind yields to the attraction to pass beyond itself, to infuse itself into the image, and reproduce itself in its life; when it *becomes*, as it were, for the time being that which it contemplates. This activity is always accompanied by emotion, a kind of melting of the individual life into the universal life, or that of some of its concretions. Thus Imagination comes to be called the *creative* faculty.

Manifestly in all these procedures the mind deals only with the concrete, with ideas or thoughts which have been made real and sensible. When by pure thinking the abstract idea has been disengaged, it becomes matter for thought solely; and Imagination is robbed of its material. It can do nothing with the naked ideas except by clothing them again with the body which has been abstracted. But so habitual and constant in every human being has become its exercise, that it vainly or revengefully still continues to intrude into the region of the pure ideas, annuls the abstraction, blinds itself to the fact that it has done so; engaging the mind meanwhile to draw inferences only valid if the abstraction has not been made; and thus beclouds or distorts the ideas themselves. All which has been the source of constant mistake or confusion in many mental endeavors, as well as in the meditation upon distinctively religious truth. Thus Imagination is a faculty which more than any other needs restraining and regulating, and to have its proper function clearly defined.

It would be interesting, in this connection, to make a comparison, so far as it can be made, between this faculty in the brute (which manifestly possesses and uses it) and in the human being; between its exercise when dealing with material undetermined by spirit-relations, and with that so determined. But this would be an independent and a large topic.

The faculty of Imagination is a universal human possession, yet exists in individuals in different degrees of activity. Probably its degrees are ruled by physical or physiological conditions rather than by spiritual ones. On account of these it varies in quickness and vividness, and in the extent of its range; yet in every one it is in constant activity, mediates the whole passage from abstract consciousness to any act of will, presents the immediate or remote result which gives end and impetus to action. It sometimes carries the mind out of itself so completely as to reduce the pure thought power almost to passivity, to make the man the victim of some image or ideal presentation which alone he sees, to the exclusion of everything else. This fact must affect his actual responsibility, and teaches us that to judge of the absolute moral worth of a man or his actions is no superficial problem, but one requiring no less than the Divine insight.

The errors, delusions, superstitions, impure or incoherent philosophies which have been so rife in human history, all probably owe their origin largely to the misuse of Imagination.

To exhibit some of the unfortunate results of its dealing with theological doctrines, or problems related thereto, to show thus its impotence, and then to point out and limit its true function in dealing with such matter, is my present design.

All the object-matter with which Imagination may successfully deal is contained in space. These bounded spaces, made real by the senses of sight and touch, are its proper material. But Imagination tries to compass the absolute space itself, to try its wing in the illimitable. It projects the self-consciousness into the infinite abyss, passes beyond the planets and stars and systems, to which it must give relative location; passes beyond them, to find itself in pure vacancy, with an interminable distance before it, rendered no less by any speed or any duration of time. It must abandon the endeavor, and confess its impotence, in dealing with absolute space. Instead of concluding, then, that pure space is not for Imagination, but for pure thought only, the mind, as represented by this faculty, still abides in its delusion, and supplies further objects on which it may rest, after the exhaustion of its known objects supplies an attenuated ether, or locates a far-distant heaven or paradise or hell; all which inventions may become delusions, not necessarily mischievous, but certainly troubling and misleading the thinking faculty in its search after the truth.

This, the mind's impotence to compass the infinite space, has been noted and so dealt with by Sir William Hamilton and by Dean Mansel, as to lead them to deny or misinterpret the mind's idea of the infinite, making it but a negation of the finite, and the result of the limitation of the human intellect, they not perceiving that the finite and infinite are correlatives; that one implies the other; that one is as positive as the other; that they are pure thoughts only, though necessary ones, and apprehended by a mental movement in which Imagination takes no part.

Yet this endeavor to compass the infinite need not be repressed, and has its own high reward. It brings about the emotion of the sublime. Though ending in failure, the mind has been expanded, has attempted a larger life than its customary one, and thus is hinted that we are intended and fitted for a larger life, that our career is to be an endless growth, a projection toward an ever-receding circumference — a life that will grow richer and richer forever and forever as it meets and appropriates the ever-during outgushings from the supernal and inexhaustible fountain.

Imagination may and does rightly deal much with human beings as concretes, with human souls as related to and determined by the physical organization and environment. But it has not restrained itself from attempting to deal with the spiritual *psyche*, with the human soul aloof from its bodily organization. It follows it beyond the article of death, and fills that whole region with delusions.

For our present knowledge, death is the severance of the existing bond connecting the human being with the physical universe, *as we know it*. Though by pure thinking we may find ourselves obliged to acknowledge that we cannot regard the spiritual soul after death as entirely out of relation to the physical universe, as without an environment, without organs or *media* of communication; yet this relation is an abstract one for thought, and cannot be described in the terms of our present knowledge. Hence Imagination is without its proper material, and if it attempts to disport itself here, it can only do so by covertly importing back the body and its physical relations, which, according to our present knowledge, have been abandoned or changed into something which defies conjecture. With what material Imagination may deal legitimately here needs to be carefully defined; and we shall see, later on, that it is not entirely without function.

In these, its vagaries, it dilutes the material which it brings back to suit its purpose. It deals with matter still, but with matter attenuated more and deprived of some of its properties. Thus we have stories of ghosts; of spiritual souls, which can be seen and heard, and either without gravity, or which might be touched were our senses fine enough. Thus the human soul is still figured as a material entity, located or moving in the absolute space. The world of our knowledge and the body of our mundane consciousness are thus resupplied, and the mind's endeavor to make the proper abstractions and draw the proper inferences is clogged and troubled. We need hardly here refer to the delusions and superstitions which have arisen from this source.

Thus, too, we have Heaven, and Paradise, and Gehenna, figured as having locality in space, fixed or relatively moving; and all the characteristics of our home planet carried into them; all which need not be necessarily harmful, and may have, when regulated, some practical use, but which again troubles our pure thinking, and beclouds the clearness of our doctrines. This has been a perpetual mass of *débris* for theology to clear away in its endeavored advance.

Modern science has been very helpful to theology in removing these delusions. It has taught us that the whole material universe is influx and movement; that no "thing" is at any moment what it was the moment before; that the universe has been, is, and is to be an evolution, moving steadily on to an end, which it is our endeavor to forecast and interpret; that the human body is no fixed aggregation of material particles; that its identity is not material, but ideal, a synthesis of the fixed and the changeable. In this way, through our advancing knowledge of ourselves and the world we live in, have many false notions held in the human mind, and in the Christian mind as well, been dissipated. The doctrine of the resurrection, or physical glorification, has been thus thought out more profoundly and satisfactorily, and all knowledge moved many steps toward harmonization.

All this connected knowledge has weakened greatly the propensity to intolerance which besets the natural man, and out of which Christianity is intended progressively to lead him. We have less than once of superstition, of idolatry, of bigotry and cruelty; though, alas! the tension of the elastic cord by which Christianity draws man away from these, and which is not yet severed, is relaxed, and he subsides back into them too often.

In another respect likewise Imagination has proven to be a dead-weight to thought, and has caused the mind to sink back into the obscure when it was about to mount into the light; has caused it to deny or be blind, when it was about to welcome the truth. And here, now, I must ask thoughtful attention, for the argument is very subtle.

Science endeavors, by abstraction, to analyze the material universe. It thinks away vitality and chemistry, and tries unsuccessfully to think away mechanical laws, and finding that it cannot do that, simplifies them. In all this process Imagination has been active and useful. It brings us at length from the manifestly heterogeneous to the apparently homogeneous. It gives us the nebular hypothesis, figures an immense aggregation of similar particles, extremely attenuated, removed from all possibility of relation to our present senses, and these in motion—motion according to our idea, however, and whose result is our present universe. If thought abstracts motion from this mass, it is left dead and alien, and these particles are out of all relation, except relative location in space. To make it living and productive motion must be resupplied from the spirit realm, which furnishes the pure energy, the idea, and the final cause. As long, however, as size, shape, and relative location are left to the particles of this attenuated matter, Imagination may still deal with these, though not fruitfully. Philosophic thinking must either assume this *stadium* as permanent or eternal, or must account for it. To assume it as permanent or eternal gives us the Platonic Duality, which so lowers our conception of the Divine that the mind refuses to rest in it. Besides, absolute rest is a pure hypothesis, with no philosophic need for it, and no *a posteriori* evidence to support it or even for more than a moment suggest it. Thus Philosophy takes up the problem where Science leaves it, and endeavors to account for the existence of matter, thus reduced by science to its simplest form. But it is evident that at this stage of the mental procedure Imagination is left without a foothold. If size, shape, and relative locality are abstracted, it has no longer any material with which to deal. The philosophic procedure now retires to the contemplation of spirit. It finds there only the immanent relations of the Godhead, required to think personality, thought, and love. What has been called the *actus purus* is only a timeless relation. Activity in the sense of energy producing change is a time conception, and carries us at once beyond the compass of pure spirit. There must be a somewhat upon which it is exercised. *Ex-hypothese* it is not something alien, limiting the Divine activity; therefore it must be somewhat eternal and essential to the constitution of The First Principle itself.

If the attempt is made to think activity within the circle of pure spirit, it evaporates into the conception of relation solely, and out of this no misuse can ever come. That there is a somewhat belonging to the eternal constitution of the Godhead which cannot be spoken of in the terms of pure spirit the Scriptures everywhere assert or imply ; and they call it the Divine *Doxa*, speak of it as shared by Father, Son, and Spirit before all creation. Hence creation itself is but the determination of this by the Divine thought and energy. Thus Science, Philosophy, and Revelation, all lead us by their several pathways to this, and in this way find their desired reconciliation.

But now occurs the observation and confusion wrought by Imagination. The mind, instead of resting content with the recognition of this to which it has been led by pure thinking, yields to the impulse of Imagination, and attempts to deal with this abstract Divine Glory, which it can only do by bringing back the very relations which have been abstracted, and dealing with it as if determined. Thus the very Duality which thought had avoided is brought back by Imagination.

When thus presented, Revelation and Philosophy present their objections to this Duality, and rightly ; yet the ordinary mind, and even the theological mind, still fettered by the imaginative delusion, comes to deny or fail to apprehend the Divine Glory as anything objective, and degrades it into a mere subjective something, to which no meaning whatever can be attached except by presupposing the possible regard of created intelligence ; and thus it is lost to the mind as anything eternal or Divine. It is commonly regarded as the Divine wealth of ideas merely, for which we have another word, the Divine Logos, or the Divine complacency or love, not seeing that this can undergo no suspension or diminution.

Yet the Scriptures interpose many safeguards against this tendency. They nowhere identify the Divine Glory with pure being, or thought, or love. They make it the property of neither Father, Son, nor Holy Spirit, except through mutual possession. They speak of it as something shared by them, as something by virtue of which the universe may become and has become, and which the universe declares and shows forth. They connect it rather with the material than with the spiritual ; never speak of it in the terms of spirit, but rather as that from which the material in its first form came. Its first determination, according to these writings, was the creation of Light, which, to be known as Light by those yet to be, and for whom was the creative fiat, must be contrasted with the obscure. God only lives in the pure Glory. All created intelligence must live in the determined Light, and from this contrast of the clear and the obscure all the boundless richness and the varied beauty of the universe have become.

Thus the interference of Imagination has so presented this doctrine to the mind as to make it objectionable, and has led to the denial or the oblivion of an essential truth. It has brought about this prolonged discord between Revelation, Philosophy, and Science, and hindered the work of unification. That which ought to be, and is, a mere negative attitude of the mind halting, as Imagination, before that to which it has been led by abstraction, yet as the pure thought power availing itself of it to unify its content, is consorted into a positive attitude asserting something, which, if any predications whatever are made concerning it, must be regarded as still material. Thus to the naked idea which thought requires as essential to unification, Imagination has given body and content ; has thus hung a weight upon thought, and confused and postponed the attempted classification of Christian doctrine.

Also, in dealing with the Godhead in its immanent relations with it as pure spirit, Imagination has led into incoherent views, not necessarily harmful, but also into errors which are mischievous and have caused many of the strifes and divisions of Christendom.

The declarations of the Christian Scriptures authorize the ascription of personality to what is called the Father, as well as to that which is called the Son and the Holy Spirit ; and also the ascription to each of these of essential Divinity. To reconcile these statements is a problem for pure thinking, in which the Christian mind regards itself as having succeeded. But Imagination here likewise interferes, and ascribes to each of these the characteristics of human personality. It figures three several consciousnesses (if this word can be rightly pluralized), each in itself independent, neither necessary to this thought of the other ; hence three wills, or possible activities, only arbitrarily in accord, or in accord from the moral necessity of love. Thus we have a virtual Tritheism, with its attendant difficulties. The doubting mind relents from this, and divisions in Christendom have arisen in consequence. The expressed mind of the Church in its conciliar decisions has guarded against this, but the propensity still persists. No doubt the common Christian mind, ever victimized by Imagination, thinks the Christian doctrine of the Trinity in this Tritheistic way, which may not necessarily be harmful to its devotional or practical life, but also may and has been. No doubt this has helped along the propensity to multiply the objects of worship, and has encouraged the cultus of the Blessed Virgin and other saints. It is then needful that Theology should so rule the public Christian instruction as to obviate this propensity, and render needless the assaults of unbelief or misbelief.

The Christian Scriptures have guarded against this propensity, likewise give no encouragement to it. They furnish material for Imagination in thinking the last manifestation of the Divine in the Incarnate Son; stimulate it in setting forth so clearly and minutely and amply Jesus Christ and His career. Here Imagination cannot be too busy or do too much. But they furnish no suggestion, help, or stimulus to Imagination in dealing with the Father or the Holy Spirit. These only manifest themselves to human apprehension in symbols, in the voice, or the tongues of flame, or otherwise; in symbols variable, and which give no hint whatever of the essential being of what they symbolize, and are only *media* of communication.

Again, at the time of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, Imagination is very apt to busy itself in a manner not indicated by the requirements and significance of this ordinance. As when it creates a mental image of Jesus' concrete Divine-human person, and connects it with the transaction then ensuing. This here has no special significance, and is no whit different from what may be done at any other time. It is a mere arbitrary juxtaposition, is not required at the time, and rather diverts the mind from its proper work. Also, when certain views of this sacrament are held, Imagination endeavors to present some indeterminate, vague, and shadowy image of Our Lord's flesh and blood beneath the shews of the bread and the wine, to imagine a miracle, in short, in which attempt failure is inevitable, and the effort has been wasted. This important effort, which is absolutely without result, has even been called an act of faith, and this significant word, with its profound ethical and religious implications, has thus been applied to a mere mental effort, which, even if it could be successful, could have no reaction upon the character.

As a final illustration, we may note that in dealing with the problems of eschatology the vagaries of Imagination have been markedly mischievous. In dealing with the condition of souls after death, and drawing inferences, the mind, in the imaginative effort, overpasses the bound where pure thought has left the doctrine of the Intermediate State, and carries into it still the universe as determined according to our present knowledge. It carries the material elements, with all their properties (however refined, still material); it carries the human body, with its possible enjoyments and sufferings, into this abstract realm, and gives us purgatorial fires, or some other forms of physical pain or enjoyment. Even in dealing with the resurrected bodies, whether glorified or not, it still regards them as fixed aggregations of matter, and gives them spatial or dynamic determinations similar to our present ones. All which may not be necessarily harmful in the practical life, but which is certainly misleading in the endeavor to express the truth. In dealing with the fate of evil souls it has run riot, and the symbolic language of Holy Scripture, of fire and brimstone and the undying worm, has been taken literally. Thus the language intended to inspire moral dread of sin has been made to produce merely physical shrinking from apprehended pain. Imagination has also given occupations to Satan for which there is no Scriptural warrant, and thus has been thrown into disrepute and met with denial the profound yet difficult doctrine of spiritual evil. Indeed, for Imagination the future life is our present life still, with changes only arbitrarily introduced; while, in truth, the fate of the evil ones is for thought only, and no imaginative presentation is trustworthy.

The endeavor has been made to interpret the Divine Comedia of Dante as symbolical, on the ground that a mind so keen and capacious as his could not be content with views so crass of the future life, if the poem were intended to be literally interpreted. There is probably truth in this, and the poem must not be taken to express Dante's deliberate theologic opinion. But his scientific knowledge was so meagre that it is questionable whether he was able to emancipate himself from the erroneous views of his time, and these must necessarily have affected his philosophic system. It is doubtful, then, whether the poem was intended to symbolize any system of thought or to do more than illustrate and emphasize certain truths of the Divine moral government.

Milton, too, in dealing with similar object-matter, uses Imagination very freely. His poem would not be interesting had he not done so. But it is questionable whether we are right in inferring his theologic opinion from this—that, for instance, he thought Satan what he here presents him, full of the possibilities of good. He would not have been interesting had he been made purely evil. It is doubtful, too, for the same reason, whether we can rightly infer from the poem alone Milton's alleged Arianism. The conception of the Eternal Son is modified for the needs of the poem, to effect its pictorial power.

Poets, as such, can deal only with the concrete. Verse ceases to be poetry when it deals with the abstract. Therefore poets claim the right to abandon themselves very freely to Imagination, and their philosophic thought cannot be accurately inferred from their poetic works. I have very little confidence in the attempts so often made of late to read into the lines of Dante, Shakespeare, Milton, or Goethe a labored and reasoned system of philosophy. The whole naive movement of the poetic mind is diverse from this, and it has to do some violence to itself to throw itself into the philosophic attitude. One power is weakened by the exercise of the other, and poets love their own the best, and cease to be poets when they become philosophers. Some minds, in which both tendencies have been in struggle, might doubtless have accomplished grander work had they yielded themselves entirely to one propensity or the other. Truth cannot be made explicit for thought by imagery, by symbolization. But symbolization may give delight, and strengthen faith by hinting of the noumenon veiled in the beautiful phenomena, and thus carry the mind down into the depths, so as that a unified system comes to be divined rather than thought out, and one, too, in which the concrete still remains in all its warmth. Philosophy proper brings no emotion, while poetry brings it to the full. The one is cold, the other is warm; and this heat sometimes dissolves error, precipitates it, and leaves the purer light. In this work Imagination is the dearest and most satisfying power that the human being possesses.

Let me now speak, and with necessary brevity, yet with reluctance to decline a subject so fascinating, of some of its uses.

Much has been said from time to time of the use of Imagination in scientific investigation, and I remember to have read years ago an article by Professor Tyndall upon this very thesis. I am inclined to think, however, that to maintain this position the word may have been used wrongly or applied too extensively.

In accumulating the facts concerning the material universe which are to be explained, Memory and Imagination have, of course, been busy, and by the latter power are held and retained in their aggregation or apparent integrity. But in the endeavor to discover their fundamental law, or to unify them, a provisional or conjectural theory is supplied by the mind, which may prove inadequate to explain the whole, or may do so partially. This is not drawn directly from the special facts themselves, but is suggested spontaneously, or possibly from a larger induction, whose extent overlaps the present material, yet which does not come at the time into distinct mental vision. An illustration of this is the Atomic theory, which serves provisionally to connect the facts, and enables many useful conclusions to be drawn, making of chemistry a progressive, comparatively clear, and practical science; yet whose failure to account for other facts throws again the theory into suspicion, and forbids mental rest; and thus it is not held as the absolute truth. But indeed the interposition of this or any other theory is not the work of Imagination, which deals only with the actual concrete, or with ideal recombinations of the same. It is rather the work of pure thought, in which the scientific mind becomes philosophic in spite of itself. It is a tentative movement toward the discovery of a First Principle. It is derived rather from the mystical elements of our complex being, springs from its predispositions, and a more or less profound sinking into their depths. It comes up thus from the depths so spontaneously as to seem an intuition or a revelation. But no sooner has this law been supplied by pure thought than Imagination seizes it at once, and busies itself with its application and constructs its universe accordingly. It magnifies the invisible, intangible atoms into something, which the senses, were they sharp enough, might lay hold of, and thus only follows the guidance of pure thought, which again has only followed the innate predispositions implied in the creative idea.

All the concretes in the universe, in their integrity, or their elements, are the proper food for Imagination. It may deal with the material as determined by the spiritual, although with the abstract spiritual it can do nothing. The mind only possesses all that comes within the compass of the intuitions of the senses, for all its uses, its truth, and its beauty, by virtue of Imagination. This is the mediating passage-way between these and all human activity. Every human being of necessity uses it, though with greatly variant degrees of power or vividness. Its activity is always emotion, sometimes distressing, but ordinarily delightful. The emotions of Beauty and Sublimity are simply its activity—the soul thus rejoicing in its power to infuse itself into, to live in the life of that which it contemplates—wherein is the coalescence of its own freedom with the Divine liberty. The emotion of the Beautiful is simply the recognition that the movement of the universe is free and not necessitated, except by the self-necessitation of love. In human experience all enthusiasm and its resultant activity come from the unusual power and vividness of this faculty. Thus it enlarges and enriches the whole sphere of life, which, on the other hand, is narrowed and impoverished by its feebleness.

Into the religious life, into the contemplation of Christian truth, its activity may be legitimately carried. Heaven, as a commonwealth of holy souls, of glorified bodies, with a fluent and subservient environment, is a field into which it may safely venture and expatiate. By dwelling upon the rational satisfaction, the supreme beauty of this presentation, it may strengthen the loving and sacrificial disposition and harden the spiritual fibre.

Into Gehenna it is dangerous for it to venture. There are no materials there for it to combine. It is the region of poverty, where there is no beauty nor satisfaction, no variety or expression. Imagination must fail here as it fails to compass the infinitely little in space, which yet the thinking mind cannot deny. And even into Hades imagination must cautiously venture, for, as I have said, it is almost sure to carry this present world with it in such an enterprise, and the result of its contemplation is untrustworthy. But so far as Paradise has any characteristics of the ultimate Heaven, in the loving soul and the expanding intelligence, it may furnish material with which Imagination may profitably deal. Thus those who mourn departed ones are not forbidden to think of them under these limitations, and to think of them as the interceding heart requires.

And especially may Imagination find its dearest and most precious use in recalling for contemplation the image of Jesus Christ, as displayed in His career, His deeds, and His words. This is our human brother, the tender, sympathetic one, the suffering and yet the majestic one. This is God's manifestation of Himself as loving and benignant, as beneficent yet severe. Imagination can do no better thing than to fasten securely in the mind, to weave this image into the soul's own structure.

They "builded better than they knew," perhaps, these evangelists, who so recorded the events of that wonderful career as to display so clearly that mind and heart, now thought as human, and now again as Divine, but rightly, though mystically, in the union and coalescence of the Divine and human, as to exhibit that character to which human history furnishes nothing like, and with such attractiveness that the deepest abyss of our nature is reached, and we feel ourselves drawn irresistibly by the tender compulsion of love, to meet this Divine-human heart, hardly knowing, when we yield, that we are entering upon a pathway that leads endlessly upward.

In the yielding to this supreme attraction the will represents, not the transient phase of the character, but the original constituents of human nature, the profound predispositions toward the good with which God created us, and which through evil had been turned inward upon themselves, into discord and confusion. Imagination has thus enabled this easy victory of the Divine love. And if those in whom this faculty is less active do still, from moral and mental needs, yield to the truth of Christ, making more of a sacrifice and putting forth more spiritual strength—this shows that the Providence of God and the supplemented activity of the Holy Spirit have recognized these differences in human structure, and proportioned their environment and their influence accordingly. These differences and degrees in imaginative power are dependent probably upon the degrees of fineness in the physical structure, upon brain-conditions merely. When the souls are emancipated from these, and subside into a purer consciousness, such differences will be equalized ; and all will be alike in possessing the immediate intuition.

Yet the differences in soul structure, enabling an endless variety and not a monotonous sameness in the company of the holy ones, must be prolonged into the heavenly life itself. How to explain these and exhibit as possible different modes of activity, is a speculative enquiry into which I will not now enter. But to our present thinking Imagination will still be exercised, and according to subjective needs, in the heavenly state. The spiritual soul will still constantly objectify itself, and infuse itself into that which it contemplates or creates, into the endless concretions of the Divine thought, or its own recombinations of the same, into the spiritual souls which will not forbid, which will freely fuse themselves together.

Thus we see that human Imagination is a reflection of the Divine, inasmuch as it is the ability of the creature to do, under limitations progressively removed, what God does—to live in and enjoy that which it creates. Its activity is one element of the evidence that man is God's image. From the reward of delight which its normal activity brings we infer that the sights and sounds of the material universe which bring this joy are not dead and passive phenomena, are not transitory things, but living and everlasting; that God is in them, and His complacency in them, that they are His free movement and not necessitated from any alien source; that their blossoming into that wonderful characteristic of beauty which we seize and appropriate with such transport is one aspect of the coalescence of God with His human creature; that we, too, shall have unfettered power and unlimited resources, and that for this we were created.

ON THE RECENT CORROBORATIONS OF SCRIPTURE FROM THE REGIONS OF HISTORY AND NATURAL SCIENCE.

BY THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

From *The Sunday School Times*, Philadelphia, September 27, 1890.

PRELIMINARY.

It is to be observed that many of the favorite subjects of scientific or systematic thought in the present day are of a nature powerfully tending to strengthen or assist the arguments available for the proof of religion and for the authority of Scripture. If it had been actually proved, as it is largely argued and seriously held, that the vast and diversified scheme of organic life throughout the world has been evolved from a few simple types, or possibly from one, such a demonstration would both enlarge and confirm the great argument of design. For this argument, instead of being drawn from particular and separate constructions, would then be drawn from the entire scheme, and from the relation of all its parts to one another, inasmuch as every earlier portion of it would be an indication, and therefore a prediction, of all those which were to succeed, the seed of a series of coming harvests. "Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge."*

Again, the formal treatment, in recent years, of the subject of heredity, not only tends to link the generations of mankind in one, but, in proving that our nature undergoes incessant modification through the influence of progenitors, enlarges our conception of the width of its range and the varieties of the forms which it is capable of assuming. It shows us, for example, how the nature as well as the environment of descendants is deteriorated by the fault of ancestors, and how there may have been an education of the race from childhood to maturity, or converse processes of decay. Thus the doctrine of birth-sin, as it is sometimes called, is simply the recognition of the hereditary disorder and degeneracy of our natures; and of all men the evolutionist would be the last to establish a title to object to it in principle.

On these grounds, and on others more specific, which it will be the aim of this paper to set forth in given instances, we should dispel wholly from our minds those spectral notions of antagonism between religion and science which have been raised up by the action of prejudice on the one side, and perhaps of boasting on the other. Of religion and of science, as of man and wife, let us boldly say, "What God hath joined, let not man put asunder." But I proceed to particular illustrations.

I.—AS TO THE CREATION STORY.

A double confirmation has, I conceive, now been supplied to the Creation Story of Genesis; the first by natural, and the second by historic, science.

Perhaps we have been too readily satisfied with assuming, in regard to this narrative, a defensive position; whereas it may be found to contain within its own brief compass, when rightly considered, the guarantee of a Divine communication to man strictly corresponding with what in familiar speech is termed Revelation.

We have here in outline a history of the planet which we inhabit, and of the celestial system to which it belongs. Of the planet, and of the first appearance and early developments of life upon it, anterior to the creation of man, in many of the principal stages which have been ascertained by geology. Of the celestial organization to which our earth belongs, whether in all its vastness or only within the limits of the solar system we can hardly say, but at the least a sketch of the formation of that system from a prior and unadjusted or chaotic state. Upon such a document a sharp issue is at once raised, at least as to the latter or strictly terrestrial part of it, the earth history, for all those who hold it to be in its substance a true account. We accept as demonstrated a series of geological conclusions. We have found the geology of Genesis to stand in such a relation to these conclusions as could not have been exhibited in a record framed by faculties merely human, at any date to which the origin of the Creation Story can now reasonably be referred. Starting from our premise, we have no means of avoiding or holding back from the conclusion that the materials of the story could not have been had without preterhuman aid, and that preterhuman aid is what we term Divine Revelation. And if the time shall ever come when astronomy shall be in a condition to apply to the earlier portion of the chapter the demonstrative methods which geology has found for the latter part, it may happen that we shall owe a debt of the same kind to astronomy as we now owe to geologic science. My present purpose is to call particular attention to the exact nature and extraordinary amount of that debt.

---

* Psa. 19 : 2.

There was nothing necessarily unreasonable in accepting as worthy of belief this portion of the Book of Genesis, along with the rest of the Book, and with other books of Holy Scripture, on general proofs of their inspiration, if sufficient, apart from any independent buttress either of science or of history to the Creation Story. In a court of justice, the evidence of a witness is to be accepted on matters within his cognizance, when his character and intelligence are not questioned; or again, when the main part of a continuous narrative is sufficiently verified, it may be right to accept the rest without separate verification. If a new witness comes into court, and pretends to give us fresh and scientific proof of the Creation Story, this may be true or may be false. If false, the story is not disproved, but stands where it stood before. Bad arguments are often made for a good cause. But if true, the event is one of vast importance.

Now, the present position is as follows: Apart altogether from faith, and from the general evidences of Revelation, a new witness has come into the court, in the shape of Natural Science. She builds up her system on the observation of facts, and upon inferences from them, which at length attain to a completeness and security such as, if not presenting us with a demonstration in the strictest sense, yet constrain us, as intelligent beings, to belief.

The Creation Story divides itself into the cosmological portion, occupying the first nineteen verses of the chapter, and the geological portion, which is given in the last twelve. The former part has less, and the latter part has more, to do with the direct evidence of fact, and the stringency of the authority which the two may severally claim varies accordingly; but in both the narrative seems to demand, upon the evidence as it stands, rational assent. In regard to both, it is held on the affirmative side that the statements of Genesis have a certain relation to the ascertained facts and the best accepted reasonings; and thus this relation is of such a nature as to require us, in the character of rational investigators, to acknowledge in the written record the presence of elements which must be referred to a superhuman origin. If this be so, then be it observed that natural science is now rendering a new and enormous service to the great cause of belief in the unseen, and is underpinning, so to speak, the structure of that divine revelation which was contained in the Book of Genesis by a new and solid pillar, built up on a foundation of its own from beneath.

It is, then, to be borne in mind, that, as against those who, by arbitrary or irrational interpretation, place Genesis and science at essential variance, our position is not one merely defensive. We are not mere reconcilers, as some call us, searching out expedients to escape a difficulty, to repel an assault. We seek to show, and we may claim to have shown, that the account recorded in the Creation Story for the instruction of all ages has been framed on the principles which, for such an account, reason recommends; and that, interpreted in this view, it is at this juncture like the arrival of a new auxiliary army in the field while the battle is in progress; like the arrival, to choose an historical instance, of the Prussians at Waterloo.

Such is the confirmatory argument founded upon the contents. But now yet another ally has come to join our ranks, under the title of Archæologic and Historic Science. It has deciphered the cuneiform inscriptions, and has read among them a creation story inscribed on the tablets found at Nineveh. Here we have a new witness to the very early existence, among civilized or partly civilized men, of records of creation corresponding in very essential particulars with the Hebrew narrative. Such a witness plainly, to some extent, offers to it confirmation ; but also stands in competition with it. The competition is in those particulars where the accounts are not in harmony. As to these, standing on the character of its contents, the Hebrew tradition lays claim to superior antiquity and authority. But in proving the vast antiquity of certain fundamental ideas, the two are concurrent, and not competitive.

The Babylonian Creation Story is given by Mr. Smith in his "Assyrian Discoveries,"* so far as its mutilated state permits. It runs as follows, and we cannot, I think, but cherish the hope that it may hereafter receive extension or elucidation : "When the gods in their assembly made the universe, there was confusion, and the gods sent out the spirit of life. They then create the beast of the field, the animal of the field, and the reptile or the creeping thing of the field, and fix in them the spirit of life. Next comes the creation of domestic animals, and the creeping things of the city." Here we have, 1, creation by the gods ; 2, chaos ; 3, life, and only by inference, order ; 4, wide extension of this life in beasts and reptiles ; 5, after this the domesticated animals. Thus there is before us a real, though rude and imperfect, structural resemblance to the Hebrew narrative, together with the interpolation of polytheism.

From the works of Schrader† on the cuneiform inscriptions, some further particulars may be gathered. He observes that in Berosus, as in Genesis, we begin with water and darkness. On which I would only observe that Berosus, who wrote in Greek, may not improbably have known the Mosaic writings,‡ and that water, in the text of Genesis, may be equivalent to fluid. The marked points of correspondence appear to be these : that the heavenly bodies are created after the heavens, which, I presume, may be meant to include the light. That the land population follows that of the water, and appears when vegetation has already begun. That the monuments name a Babylonian week, with the seventh day as a day of consecration, called also an evil day,* perhaps because evil for any work done on it. The inscription says,

> "To redeem them, created mankind
> The merciful one, in whom is the power that summons to life."

which is faintly comparable with the words of Genesis 2 : 7, and the Jehovistic account, "and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." What seems to disappear from the Babylonian account is that evident intention of series and orderly development, or evolution, which is so wonderful a feature in the Mosaic narrative.

Dawson, in a recent work, observes that the polytheistic element is the distinctive feature of the Chaldean record, and that the originals of the tablets from Nineveh may have been very ancient, but that they are so mixed up with the history of a Chaldean hero, named Izdubar, as to suggest that there may have existed before it still older creation legends. He compares this record with the corresponding account in Genesis, which is as broadly marked with the idea of the Divine unity as the Chaldean legend is pervaded by the conception of polytheism. And he adds, "Is it not likely that the simpler belief is older than the more complex ; that which required no priests, ritual, or temple, older than that with which all these things were necessarily associated ?" He naturally assigns a marked superiority to the "Hebrew Genesis."† In truth, that superiority seems to be not great only, but immeasurable. In one point only do the tablets go beyond the narrative of Genesis ; they record the great struggle with rebellion, the war in heaven between Merodach and Tiamat. But, upon the whole, our Bible narrative is a regular structure ; it is orderly, progressive, and rational ; that of the tablets is dark and confused. This may, however, be referable in part to the imperfection of the tablets, the third of which, Mr. Sayce thinks, may probably have recounted the formation of the earth.‡ The one is charged in a marvellous way with instruction and moral purpose ; from the other they have almost disappeared. The first has, as we believe, been receiving marked confirmation in the most vital particulars from cosmic and geologic science ; on the second, they can hardly be said to cast more than the faintest light. And yet this inferior document is itself of very great confirmatory value ; for the Izdubar legends, says Mr. Smith,§ appear to have been composed more than 2000 years B.C. There is no late date to which the Mosaic narrative can with a shadow of probability be referred. It could not have been formed without a miracle from the tablets as they stand. The two are evidently accounts proceeding from a common source, but derived through independent channels. The one comes through a powerful and civilized empire, the other through an obscure nomad family. In the relative superiority of the Mosaic narrative all the rules of merely human likelihoods are reversed, and the presumption of a Divine illumination is proportionably augmented. But the unsuspected antiquity of the inferior legend attests by an independent witness, if not the truth, yet at least the presumable origin, of its transcendent rival.

---

* Page 397.
† Schrader, "The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament." Translated by Whitehouse. Vol. I., pp. 4, *seqq.*
‡ Smith, Biog. Dict.

* Schrader, I. 19.
† "Modern Science in Bible Lands," p. 32.
‡ "Hibbert Lectures," p. 394.
§ "Assyrian Discoveries," p. 166.

So far as scientific opinion is concerned, another remarkable confirmation seems to have been given to the cosmical portion of the Creation Story in Genesis by the course which it has taken of late years. Writing in 1839, Dr. Whewell devoted a chapter of his "Bridgewater Treatises on Astronomy and Physics"* to the Nebular, or, as it is often called, Rotatory hypothesis. He described it in outline, as it had been conceived by La Place. The idea of it was that the mass which eventually centred in the sun, revolved in a state of excessive heat; that, as it gradually cooled, the rapidity of its motion was increased; that, as the centrifugal force thus grew, the mass detached from itself exterior zones or rings of gas or vapor, which most commonly broke up into several minor masses, and so gradually formed the planetary system. Dr. Whewell's object in this early notice of a subject, which has since attracted, I believe, very general attention in the world of astronomical science, was to sustain and illustrate his general argument, by showing how this theory did nothing whatever to explain the origin of the system, or to weaken the statement of Newton, that its admirable arrangement must be "the work of an intelligent and most powerful being." The origin of this rotation, said Dr. Whewell, remains unexplained, and still as powerfully as ever cries aloud for, and proclaims, an Author. My purpose in here naming the subject is to point out that Dr. Whewell then found himself dealing with a theory which had not yet obtained any wide currency or authority, and he then "left to other persons and to future ages to decide upon the merits of the nebular hypothesis."* But, during the half century which has elapsed since he produced his Treatise, this hypothesis is understood to have gained very general acceptance from astronomers. I refer to this result of the most modern studies as a new and remarkable establishment of accord between natural science on the one hand (so far as its reasonings have proceeded) and the Book of Genesis on the other. Often has it been endeavored to place the Mosaic geology in conflict with ascertained results, but comparatively little of the same kind has been attempted, so far as I know, by persons of scientific authority, with regard to the cosmogony which occupies the earlier portion of the chapter. On the other hand, it has been shown, with what seems to me conclusive clearness, that, without the use of scientific language, that very process has been described in slight outline, but in singular correspondence with the hypothesis now so largely accepted. That hypothesis may not indeed have reached the point of demonstration, and this the subject-matter itself may be found not to permit; yet it has attained to so much of authority from consent that Dr. Whewell, were he writing now, would not have had simply to hand it over to the future for consideration, but would more probably have declared that it holds the field, and seems little likely to be displaced from it.

With the creation of the world or the solar system, the question of its termination is naturally associated. On this subject, however, I will not dwell at length, because the support here afforded by scientific opinion is given to the Scriptures of the New Testament rather than the Old. To refer again to Dr. Whewell. In a passage of extraordinary grandeur, he delivered (I think in a sermon) his opinion that the world would end with a catastrophe, instead of dying what is termed a natural death. Such, as we know, is the emphatic declaration of the inspired Word: "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night: in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; and the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up."† And again, "Looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat." These were the words of Dr. Whewell nearly half a century ago. They were delivered rather as by one uttering his own firm opinion, than as expressing the conviction of astronomers at large. Nevertheless, as I have been informed on high authority, it is now the established conclusion of astronomers, reasoning from ascertained facts, that the Galilean fishermen knew what all the genius and learning of the world for thousands of years failed to discover, and that

---

* Chap. VII., p. 181.

* Page 190.

† 2 Peter 3 : 10, 12.

> "The great globe itself,
> Yea all, which it inherit, shall dissolve." *

II.—AS TO THE FLOOD STORY.

I pass now to the Flood-Legend, one form of which has come down through Berosus and Josephus, but which acquires much more certain antiquity, and greater grandeur, from the inscriptions. Their account, says Schrader, whose bias cannot, I think, be considered as friendly toward the Hebrew record, "brings the biblical narrative into much closer relation with the Chaldean flood-legend than could be assumed on the basis of the tradition in Berosus."† It forms part of the Izdubar legends discovered by Mr. George Smith, who published his account of them in 1872, and who assigns to them a date anterior to 2000 years B.C. under the early Babylonian empire.‡ The hero of the legends is believed by Mr. Smith to be the same as the Nimrod of Genesis. Like the Creation Story of Genesis, that of the Flood derives corroboration from the Babylonian record, inasmuch as it is thus carried back by an independent testimony to a very great antiquity. That record, composed, as Mr. Smith thinks, not long after the time of Izdubar or Nimrod, gives us the tradition of a flood which was a divine punishment for the wickedness of the world, and of a holy man who built an ark and escaped the destruction.§ The particulars are set out in this volume. They differ in many respects from those of Genesis; but the essential features are in the highest degree marked, and, together with certain of the details, are singularly accordant.‖ As in the case of the Creation Story, so here there is stamped upon them the note of a common source, and of channels of descent separated at some later date. In this case, however, the Babylonian narrative holds a higher position relatively to the scriptural record than in the case of the Creation.

The hero of the deluge is Hasisadra—a name which has been Hellenized into Xisuthrus—who, on the eleventh tablet, relates to Izdubar (the supposed Nimrod) the story of the deluge. I shall only attempt an outline presenting the main points.*

In the ancient city of Surippah, where Anu and other great gods were worshipped, Hasisadra was divinely warned by Hea, the great water-god, to construct a ship, of which the size is named, and commit to it "the seed of life, all of it," as "the sinner and life" were about to be destroyed by a flood. Food, furniture, wealth, servants, and animals were all to be embarked. The building and loading of the ship are then described, and the part taken by the several gods in bringing about the catastrophe. But "the gods" themselves feared the tempest, and "ascended to the heaven of Anu." This deluge lasted for six days: on the seventh all was quiet. There is sight of land from within the vessel. It is arrested by the mountain of Nizir. A dove is sent forth, and returns. A swallow is sent, and does the like. A raven goes, feeds on the corpses that are afloat, and returns not. Then comes landing, sacrifice, the sending forth of animals. Ninip and Hea then remonstrate with Bel, and suggest other more usual means of chastizing men, in which there seems to be some affinity to the promise of Genesis 8 : 21, 22, and 9 : 11-17, that there should never again be a flood upon the earth. And "then dwelt Hasisadra in a remote place at the mouth of the rivers."†

The resemblances between this narrative of the flood and that in Genesis are such as clearly to betoken a relationship at or near the source. The most peculiar, and at the same time purely incidental, among all the details of the narrative, appears to be the threefold experiment with birds upon the decline of the waters; but this appears alike in the three narratives of Chaldæa, the Bible, and Berosus. No other nations have accounts so full and precise as these.‡

Mr. Smith has some judicious and impartial observations on the two accounts.§ The Chaldean account indicates the nature of the country in which the flood took place. Surippah is near the mouth of the Euphrates, and there Hea was worshipped as the God of the deluge. The Hebrew account has no local confirmations of the story. When Surippah was conquered, in the sixteenth century B.C., or earlier, it is called in the record "the city of the ark." Hasisadra is, like Noah, a devout man; and the Chaldean deluge is, like the Hebrew, a punishment for gross and widespread sin. Schrader argued to attenuate this statement, but, as it appears to me, in the spirit of a partisan, rather than a judge.* The dimensions of the ark vary in the three accounts; and on the variations of numerals I observe elsewhere. It may, however, be observed, that the Babylonian account, which presumably was written down from a very early date, and in a durable form, has in this respect a great advantage over oral transmission, which is most of all dangerous for numerical statements. The inscription describes a regular vessel with boatmen, another incident of local color. The accounts curiously coincide in the minute point that, both inside and out, the ark is coated with bitumen. The tablet tells us that not eight only, but a comparatively large number of persons went on board. The Bible gives forty days as the duration of the flood, meaning apparently at the height. After a hundred and fifty days the water all abated. The whole duration before disappearance is a year and ten days.† The tablet allows only seven days for the fulness of the flood. On the seventh day all storm has ceased. Hasisadra then sends out the bird. The ship is stranded for seven days more on the mountains of Nizir, so that the total term mentioned is one of only fourteen days. Nizir lies away to the east, far from the site of Ararat mentioned in Genesis; on the other hand,‡ the present tradition of the country lands the ark at a site farther to the north, and nearer Ararat. Again as to the birds. In Genesis, Noah sends out a raven, which does not return; then a dove three times at intervals of seven days; on the third occasion, the dove does not return. The inscription sends, first, a dove, which returns, then a swallow, which returns, and then a raven, which does not return. Lastly, in the Bible, Noah lives after the flood for 350 years; the tablet and Berosus both assign to him, together, rather strangely, with his daughter and the helmsman,§ that translation to heaven for his piety which Genesis gives to Enoch. Before translation, he was visited by Izdubar, and the region was deemed a sacred region.

---

* Shakespeare, "Tempest," IV. 1.
† Schrader, I. 47.
‡ "Assyrian Discoveries," p. 166.
§ *Ibid.*, and p. 204.
‖ Pages 205, 206, *seqq.*

* "Assyrian Discoveries," page 184, *seqq.*
† Smith, pp. 184-194.
‡ *Ibid.*, p. 212.
§ *Ibid.*

On a general comparison of these two profoundly interesting records, the result appears to be that in what is circumstantial only there is much difference along with some curious resemblance; but in the outline of the fundamental facts, and in the moral considerations applicable, they are completely at one. The wickedness of the antediluvian world, the Divine anger, the command to build, the use of this vehicle of escape, and the erection of an altar of thanksgiving, are recorded alike in both. We have no right to assume that either of the accounts, as it stands, is contemporary with the period of the flood. The point in which the Bible account is inferior, is the absence of local coloring. Yet this, so far from impairing its claim to our acceptance, appears, on the contrary, to accredit it, because it is a feature which, given the circumstances of the case, there was reason to expect. If, indeed, we ride the hobby of the negative criticism, the Bible account bristles everywhere with difficulty. It is inconceivable that the framers should have in that case departed so widely from the inscription in points so palpable to all the world, or should have let slip the local color with which a fabricator or late relator would have been forward to dress up his narrative. But if we take Abraham, with his ancestors and his posterity, as a nomad people, religious and of simple life, such as the Bible represents them, at an earlier period hanging on the outskirts of the Babylonian power, at a later one migratory toward the West, it was natural for them to drop the local coloring of a region with which all their relations had come to an end; and this has been done, not in the case of the flood only, but throughout the Abrahamic narrative down to the entry into the promised land.

The most significant difference of all between the two records is that the inscription is based upon polytheism, while in the Bible, here as elsewhere, all is based upon the doctrine of one God. That is to say, the simpler form is the basis of the Bible narrative, and the simpler form, according to the generally recognized principle, is that nearest the source, most closely akin to the occurrence or the original record. The religion of Noah agrees with that of the common father, Adam; the religion of Hasisadra has departed from the primitive belief, and exhibits to us those multiplied and deteriorated images of the deity which human infirmity and sin had introduced.

While Schrader glances at the period when the Babylonian flood-legend reached the Hebrews as that of "the prophetic narrator of early biblical history," he candidly adds, "I am led to the obvious conclusion that the Hebrews were acquainted with this legend at a much earlier period, and that it is far from impossible that they acquired a knowledge of these and the other primitive myths now under investigation as far back as in the time of their earlier settlements in Babylonia, and that they carried these stories with them from Ur of the Chaldees." For him they are all myths; the original invention is in Babylonia, and the Hebrews are early copyists. For others, however, they are histories; and the twin versions bear testimony by their concurrence, and even in some respects by their discrepancies, to their historical character. If there was remoulding, it may be the more detailed and circumstantial narration which is presumptively entitled to the credit of it; and the Bible story, more sparing in its details, but far broader and more direct in the terrible lesson it conveys, may reasonably be judged to have come down from the source with the smallest amount of variation from the original.

---

* Vol. I., p. 49.

† Gen. 7 : 11-14, 17, 24.

‡ Smith, p. 217.

§ Schrader, I. 60.

It may be noticed that the translation to heaven of Hasisadra, the Noah of the tablets, is in curious accordance with that far larger development both of the under-world and of the future state, which marks alike the Babylonian and the Egyptian systems in comparison with that of the Old Testament, and forms an interesting but separate subject of discussion.

The Hebrew story of the Deluge has long been supported by a diversity of traditions among nations and races of the world, but never before with such particularity, or such corroboration in the sense and to the extent before described. But though we have now a new and important witness in court on our behalf, yet undoubtedly, if the narrative be provably untrue, the testimony of both, or of any number of traditional witnesses, must fall to the ground.

The voice of natural science has not been, and probably is not at present, uniform on this subject. The negative has just been presented to the world, of course with great ability, and also in a sufficiently magisterial form, by Professor Huxley. He conceives that Christian theology must stand or fall with the historical trustworthiness of the Jewish Scriptures;[*] and, as these are not trustworthy, the consequence is that it must not stand but fall. With this proposition I have here nothing to do.

Mr. Huxley selects the flood-story for the capital article of his indictment. But he treats it as little worthy of serious notice. "It is difficult to persuade serious scientific enquirers to occupy themselves in any way with the Noachian deluge."[†] He finds, indeed, a sort of historic nucleus for a partial deluge in the occasional desolating floods of the Euphrates and Tigris.[*] But be it partial or be it general, he applies the same contemptuous negative doctrine to the deluge: perhaps most of all to a particularly absurd attempt at reconciliation, which places it "at the end of the glacial epoch!"[†] I am far from intending to enter in a controversy, which I have no capacity to handle. Yet I may be bold enough to mention, that, while Mr. Huxley is speaking in the name of science at large, some votaries of science hold an entirely different language. Moreover, that the idea of a flood was not thus summarily dismissed by the luminaries of the scientific world anterior to the present day; and that the grounds of this dismissal are not of recent discovery, but were fully open to the geologists of the last generation. Quite recently the doctrine of a deluge has been maintained by Sir J. Dawson,[‡] by Mr. Howorth, and by the Duke of Argyll (if I interpret him aright),[§] all of whom are surely to be considered as "serious scientific enquirers."

Mr. Howorth, in his learned and laborious work on "The Mammoth and the Flood," is not bound by any superstitious reverence for the mere text of the Book of Genesis; for, in his preface,[‖] he casts aside as null its traditions respecting all that preceded the creation of man. He collects largely not only the diluvial traditions of so many races and countries, but an immense mass of palæontological evidence; and, having laid this wide ground for his induction, he declares that, in his judgment, the whole points unmistakably "to a widespread calamity, involving a flood on a great scale. I do not see how the historian, the archæologist, and the palæontologist can avoid making this conclusion in future a prime factor in their discussions, and I venture to think that before long it will be accepted as unanswerable."[¶]

Moreover, I am free to consider history no less a science, though a less determinate science, than geology or biology; and I quote in conclusion the following passage from Lenormant, which follows a copious collection of testimonies to the erudition of a deluge in almost all lands:

"La longue revue, à laquelle nous venons de nous livrer, nous permet d'affirmer que le récit du déluge est une tradition universelle dans tous les rameaux de l'humanité, à l'exception toutefois de la race noire. Mais un souvenir partout, aussi précis et aussi concordant, ne saurait être celui d'un mythe inventé à plaisir ; aucun mythe religieux ou cosmogonique ne présente ce caractère d'universalité. C'est nécessairement le souvenir d'un événement réel et terrible, qui frappa assez puissamment l'imagination des ancêtres de notre espèce pour n'être jamais oublié de leurs descendants. Ce cataclysme se produisit près du berceau primitif de l'humanité."*

---

[*] Nineteenth Century, July, 1890, p. 8. [†] Page 12.

[*] Nineteenth Century, July, 1890, p. 14. [†] Page 13.

[‡] "Modern Science in Bible Lands," p. 252.

[§] In the Scottish Geographical Magazine, April, 1890.

[‖] Pages ix., x. [¶] Page 463.

III.—AS TO THE GREAT DISPERSION.

The contents of the tenth chapter of Genesis constitute a document of a character altogether extraordinary ; for example, in the two following particulars. First, it is without parallel in the world. Nowhere else is there known to us a distinct and detailed endeavor to draw downward from a single source the multiplication of men in the earth by families, and the distribution of them over the face of the earth. Secondly, this account, containing seventy-two names of men (to which more are added in connection with the descent of Abram when we reach chap. 12), is so particular, that any notion of its transmission by ordinary means may appear to present much difficulty. Abram, when he migrated westward, came from a country which we now know to have possessed in his time means of durable record ; but, as the head of a nomad family, he could hardly have carried with him written traditions : and a specific narrative of this kind, like the Greek Catalogue in the "Iliad," presented great difficulties in the way of oral transmission through several, perhaps many, generations, until the time when we may reasonably suppose the children of Israel to have acquired the art of writing during their sojourn in Egypt. The assisting Providence of God may suggest itself to the believing mind as having supplied the needful measure of that aid, which Homer† besought, in a kindred case, from the Muses. But the document, if thus considered, lays a certain weight upon our faculty of belief, and even offers a tempting invitation to assault from those who are adversely minded. This weight, however, is converted at once into a prop, into a buttress which well and stoutly supports the wall, when we find that this singular and, so to speak, exposed tradition has received in the most fundamental and vital points, from the researches of philological and of historical science, striking and, we may suppose, conclusive confirmation.

The foundation of the arrangement is the threefold division of the human race from a certain period of its history. If such a division actually took place, we might expect to find the traces of it in a threefold division of language, which has an unquestionable relation to race ; and, conversely, such a divarication in language proves an early distribution of races or families, from which it took its origin. Without entering into details, it may be observed that the Book of Genesis associates the distinctions of language with the local dispersion of man ; and it is now known that, in days antecedent to the permanent bond of literature, such an association is agreeable not only to probability, but to the ascertained laws of experience. And now we find that comparative philology, dealing at large with the languages of the world, has resolved them into that very threefold division, which the distribution of man according to Genesis 10, into three great branches, anticipates and requires. Here is again an important service rendered by modern science to belief.

It is true that the Bible (Gen. 11 : 1) speaks of language as originally one, and that this proposition has not yet been generally affirmed by philology. Yet the way to it has been opened, and it need excite no surprise should the goal be soon attained. Professor Max Müller, I believe, says there is no proof that the Aryan, Semitic, and Turanian families of language had independent beginnings ; that radicals existing in all the three can be traced to the common source, and that even the grammars may have been originally one. But this subject still awaits its scientific decision.

The Table of Peoples presents on its surface some apparent anomalies ; of which, however, a rational account can be given, and one which for the most part converts them into evidences in its favor. For instance, the Hamitic portion presents to us out of a total of thirty names no less than eighteen which are plural words, and which are therefore national or tribal, while only two of the same class are found in the rest of the account. But this seems upon consideration to illustrate what we know from history; namely, that the Hamitic races exhibited the most precocious development, and set up the earliest known civilizations of the world, those of Babylonia and of Egypt.

---

* "Les Origines de l'Histoire," pp. 489, 490. Second Edition, 1880. "The long review to which we have just applied ourselves warrants our affirming that the tale of the Deluge is an universal tradition among all the branches of the human family, excepting, however, the blacks. But a remembrance prevailing everywhere, so precise and so concordant, cannot be that of a myth arbitrarily invented. No religious or cosmogonic myth presents such a character of universality. It must of necessity be a recollection of a great and terrible occurrence, which impressed the imagination of the ancestors of our race so powerfully as never to have been forgotten by their descendants. That cataclysm took place at a spot near the primeval cradle of humanity."

† Il., II. 481.

Again, the Cushite stock, after its regular order is arrested in verse 7 of the chapter, jumps, as it were, down to Nimrod in verses 8–10. But he is the only person in the Table who is described as founding a kingdom, and his position has a great resemblance to that of Izdubar in the Assyrian Tablets, with whom he is identified by Mr. George Smith.

Again, as Shem, Ham, and Japheth are four times mentioned together, and invariably in this order, it seems to follow naturally that this is the order of their ages. In chapter 10, however, their descendants are set out in the inverse order, and Japheth takes precedence. But this also, upon reflection, may seem to be quite natural. Migration was largely connected with considerations of space and food. It may be that the younger had to give place to the elder, and that the children of Japheth had on this account to be the first in moving from the common center.

Further, in the Japhetic line the genealogy wholly stops with the next generation but one, whereas it is continued farther, not only in the Semitic line, which had to be connected with Abram, but also in the Hamitic, by the mention of Nimrod and of the Philistines. This, however, seems perfectly natural if the line of Japheth, as is probable, moved the first, and, as is manifest, went the farthest so as to be out of sight of the narrator, while the descendants of Shem and Ham remained locally in contact with each other. Knobel[*] has observed that in each of the three branches the enumeration begins with those who traveled to the greatest distance from the common center (which is taken by him to be near Mount Ararat), and accordingly the Japhetites are reckoned from the northwest, the Semites from the southeast, and Hamites from the southwest. Just as, in the case of the Homeric Catalogue,[†] this methodical arrangement probably gave great assistance to the memory of the first recorder.

Knobel has discussed with great minuteness and care the particular names of the recital, and he traces them to their historic seats; as has Bishop Browne, in the "Speaker's Commentary." Some examples may be given. The Japhetites are those (Japhah) of fair complexion. They take to the isles or coast-lands,[*] the seaward countries of the north and west. Here we meet them in the Cimmerians and Cimbri. Ashkenaz, the son of Gomer, is found in Scandinavia,[†] the Scangia of Jornandus, the chief seat of the German stock. Another route is marked in the same direction by Ascania,[‡] in Asia Minor, a name found at various points of that region. Knobel thinks[§] there is a trace of the Teutonic race in Teuthras, a name found on both sides in the war of the Iliad.[‖] He proceeds with the list of Japhetites as follows. Riphath, he thinks, is traced in the Carpathian country, Togarma in Armenia, Magog in the Slavs, Madai in the Medes, Javan in the Iaones or Ionians, Elisa in Æolians, Tarshish in the Tursenoi, Kittim in the Chitians of Cyprus, Dodanim in the Dardanians, Tubal in the Iberians, Meshech in the Meschi or Moschl, Tiras in the Thracians (Thrax or Thras).[¶] Some among these particular interpretations — for instance, that given to Elisa—may be untenable. Bishop Browne[**] sets out the various opinions that have been held, mostly without declaring a preference. It is not, however, the accuracy of each particular identification, nor even of every particular item of the text, but the principles of the general arrangement, and the large number of cases reasonably clear, which give the subject its importance.

The Semitic and Hamitic branches offer less difficulty to the investigator. No part is more satisfactory than that which relates to the nations of Palestine, and to the names of Canaan, Sidon, and Heth, where every particular known to us from independent history or tradition, supports, so far as I can judge, in a most remarkable manner, the trustworthiness of the record. Speaking generally, perhaps no one can go farther than Knobel in the work of identification. His treatise is of considerable authority, and is of the greater value because he does not belong to the school of conservative criticism.

IV.—AS TO THE SINAITIC JOURNEY.

In his "Modern Science in Bible Lands," Sir J. Dawson has examined, with elaborate care, first the dwelling-place of the Israelites in Egypt, and their probable route from it until they cross the Yam Suph; and then, still more particularly, the account of their journeyings beyond the Red Sea. Thus he thinks that they had crossed at a point,* now forming part of the Bitter Lakes of the isthmus, but then a part of the Red Sea itself, which was fed in ancient times by a branch of the Nile flowing eastward.† Yam Suph, or sea of weeds, is the name given to it in the Bible.‡

---

[*] *Völkertafel der Genesis*, p. 14. Giessen, 1850.
[†] *Juventus Mundi*, p. 467.

[*] See Revised Version, Gen. 10 : 5.
[†] Knobel, *Völkertafel der Genesis*, pp. 35, 37.
[‡] Page 39.
[§] Page 44.
[‖] V. 705 and VI. 13.
[¶] Pages 53, 60, 71, 77, 81, 95, 117, 123.
[**] "Speaker's Commentary," Genesis *in loc.*

Beyond the Red Sea, and onward to the Sinaitic region, the country has been surveyed by officers of the British Ordnance. All the instruments of modern science have been employed; the results have been published on a large scale; and the effect, as reported by Sir J. Dawson, has been "entire agreement of the members of the party on essential points;§ and the ascertainment of such complete coincidence of the actual features of the country with the requirements of the Mosaic narrative, as to prove it to be a contemporary record of the events to which it relates.‖

The route pursued down the coast of the Red Sea, and then to the eastward, was peculiar, as it seems to have been dictated by a combination of strategical considerations with those which concerned the subsistence of the people, and especially the supply of water. The local indications are on this account all the more remarkable. It is not possible, without exceeding the limits proper for the present observations, to convey the full force of the evidence which shows how the stamp of Egypt was impressed both upon the Israelites themselves and upon the narrative, in Exodus, of their escape, inasmuch as it depends on the details of measurement, atmosphere, water supply, and other physical circumstances, and their relation to the Mosaic narrative. The conclusions reached have no direct bearing upon the proofs of a Divine revelation through the Scriptures, but they are of great historical importance in establishing the credit of the Book, and its contemporaneous character as to the substance of its contents.

LONDON, ENG.

H. P. LIDDON.

IN MEMORIAM.

BY REV. HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, CANON OF ST. PAUL'S, LONDON.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), October, 1890.

NOT for a moment will I pretend that I write these memorial words on Henry Parry Liddon in the spirit of an impartial critic. On the contrary, I venture to write them only in order that those thousands who admired and honored him in his public career may know a little more of what it was which those who had the privilege of his intimacy, and who dearly loved him, felt to be the peculiar value and significance of his personality. Writing of him under the very shadow of his loss, that significance and that value impress themselves with special acuteness; and the memory is quickened by an affection which can with difficulty learn to believe that a presence so vital and so exhilarating will never be found at our side again, with the look and the speech that had, for so long, been our delight.

What is it that we should say of him, if we are asked why we attributed to him such peculiar value?

I need not touch on all those obvious gifts of his, which were revealed through his preaching and his writing, and which are public property. He had literary and theological learning; he had style; he had rhetorical skill and passion. All this I can assume to be acknowledged; but what was it in him which gave force and color to all this?

Well, he had that which we call "distinction." You might agree with him, or not agree; you might criticise and discuss his gifts; but, anyhow, he had the quality of speciality. In any roomful of men, his presence was felt with a distinct and rare impression. If he let himself speak, his voice, manner, style, articulation, arrested you; you wanted to listen to him, whoever else was speaking: his phrases, his expressions, caught your ear. Here was somebody notable; so you knew. He stood out from his fellows: there was a flavor in his company which was unique.

And this impression was one which belonged to character; it was not the result of any particular and separate gift, but it made itself known through them all. Whatever he did or said was unlike another's; was characteristic of himself. And this was what gave him, to those who had the joy of his friendship, such intense and unfailing interest. In days such as ours, where the *average* standard of culture, and cleverness, and character is so high, it requires a most remarkable force of inward energy for any one to show himself clearly and distinctly above the average. It is this which makes the present generation of educated men appear so strangely dull and commonplace. Such crowds of men can come up to a very decent level; so very, very few can pass it.

---

* Page 389. † Page 392. ‡ Page 404.
§ Pages 371, 406. ‖ Page 407.

The result is that they all look exactly alike; they all talk with about the same ability; they all conform to a very respectable standard of knowledge and reading and wits; we feel that they have all been through a common mill; a very *good* mill; we do not deny that; only, good as are Huntley & Palmer's Reading Mills, it must be confessed that the biscuits are very much alike. This feeling of the common average weighs upon us, and depresses. It makes us horribly conscious that nobody need be missed—that there is certain to be only too many who are ready to take his place, and who will do as well as he. And, therefore, it is with quite a peculiar and excessive delight that we recognize one who, like Liddon, so obviously stands apart from, and above, the average. He had kept his contours free; he had never let himself be ground down to the ordinary mould. He had got the tone and quality that could never be mistaken for another's. He was, in a word, intensely interesting. To watch him, to catch his glance, his gestures, his motion, his intonation, was a perpetual joy in itself. Everything that came from him, in word or deed, was exactly typical of him. It was so sure to be like him, that it gave you the shock of a delicious surprise, every time it happened—the surprise, not of a novelty, but of recognizing so intense an identity under a novel form. You seized on it with the laughing glee of a scientific enthusiast pouncing on a new specimen, in some unexpected spot, of a favorite or familiar organism. You mentally treasured up the saying, or the act, whatever it was; you went about repeating or re-enacting it; you laughed quietly to yourself alone as you recalled it. This gave to his companionship an inexhaustible charm; it was impossible ever to be with him beyond a few minutes without adding to your stores of refreshing memories of this kind. Up something was sure to come: and it bubbled up so instinctively; and it threw itself into such varied and unexpected forms; and if once a vein was started, it developed so freely and so richly; and the happy words flowed along with such amazing rapidity of selection; and he became so confident and insistent and abundant, as he felt the reflex of your enjoyment in it; and his eye so kindled with merriment and keenness and animation, and his face so twinkled with expressive motions and brimming fancies; that, when at last you managed to drag yourself out of his affectionate grasp, as he followed you out of his room to the top of the stairs, and still held both your hands in his, and still had some last irrepressible epithet or inimitable phrase to add to the many already showered upon you; you disappeared glowing with the sense that, certainly, there was no talk like Liddon's—no one quite so special and so vitalizing.

Of course, for this to happen he required to know you, to know exactly where he stood toward you; no one was more sensitive to the social atmosphere about him. He could never expand like this except when he was sure of the surroundings. Until he had made himself aware of his company, he would repress every signal or suggestion of all this. People might interview him or meet him and never suspect the fund of imaginative and ironical humor that he was holding in restraint. But once give him confidence in you, and so long as he was in decent health, these funds never failed you. The humor was instinctive and overflowing. Not even dark hours of anxiety would be enough to subdue it. Even at times when he was writing letters full of the blackest forebodings, and when he was penetrated with pessimistic distresses, still, in the evening, when you caught him free to talk, the delicious springs of fun and brilliancy would bubble and brim with the same inevitable felicity. Mr. Frederic Harrison, in his touching little picture of him, harps on his sweet and gentle melancholy. This conveys a very partial impression. I should say that, gentle as was his manner, with its soft tenderness of courtesy, and its priestly touch of anxiety, still there was no one on earth whose eye was so sure to greet one with a beaming look of alertness, or who was so quick in response to any fun. Nor, again, should I say that his habitual gentleness could at all conceal the fire that glowed beneath it, and which would kindle into ready flame at any provocation that was aware how to rouse it. There were subjects on which he would speak with a vehement excitement that grew hotter as it found words; and he had this mark of the natural orator, that the language would win epigrammatic force and precision, according to the measure of the heat that burned behind it; and again the brilliancy of the epigrams that flowed from his lips would feed and renew the heat. At such times it was evident how explosive were the forces of that sensitive physique, which he had to manage and control under the restraint of a delicate and disciplined courtesy.

Such a personality, so fresh, so vivid, so abundant, so elastic, so vivacious, was bound to be ever interesting and ever charming. Nor was this freshness, this elasticity of character, the least diminished by the fact that, intellectually, his lines were singularly formal and motionless. On the contrary, is it not often true that humor and imagination play with fullest freedom round and about an intellectual pivot which is absolutely fixed? The very fixity of the convictions sets these forces loose, unhindered by any interior anxiety. They are relieved from the labor of working out and determining the position to be taken up, and their entire energy is free to skirmish outside—to attack, to defend, to repudiate, to "chaff," to detect weak points in opponents' armor, to summon up all available resources in succor of the position adopted. Definite and unhesitating convictions are an immense gain to the advocate and to the logician; they form the finest background for humor, for irony, for imagination. The man whose convictions are themselves in the act of growing is bound to offer magnificent opportunities to a quick and acute logic, and to a brilliant sense of the ridiculous. Such opportunities were never missed by Liddon. He had all his weapons ready. His appreciation of the absurd was like an instinct; and the moment that the absurd had been sighted, his imagination was up and after it like a greyhound slipped from the leash.

Here was his power in talk, and in writing. His intellect, as such, would never stir. You could anticipate, exactly, the position from which he would start. It never varied. He had won clear hold on the dogmatic expressions by which the Church of the Councils secured the Catholic belief in the Incarnation; and there he stood with unalterable tenacity. Abstract ideas did not appeal to him: for philosophy he had no liking, though, naturally, he could not fail in handling it to show himself a man of cultivated ability. But it did not affect him at all: he never felt drawn to get inside it. He did not work in that region. His mental tone was intensely practical; it was Latin, it was French, in sympathy and type. For Teutonic speculation he had a most amusing repugnance. Its misty magniloquence, its grotesque bulk, its immense clumsiness, its laborious pedantry, which its best friends admit, brought out everything in him that was alert, rapid, compact, practical, effective, humorous. There was nothing against which his entire armory came into more vivid play—his brilliant readiness, his penetrating irony, his quick sense of proportion, his admirable and scholarly restraint, his delicate grace, his fastidious felicity of utterance. There was no attraction on the speculative side to make him hesitate in these excursions of his; he saw no reason to expect any gain from these philosophers, while, on the other hand, he was acutely alive to the perils of such intellectual adventures.

So he stood, absolutely rooted, in the region of thought. Nothing arrived to color, or expand, his intellectual fabric. To novel ideas—to the ideas that are still in growth, especially—he offered no welcome, so far as his own inner habit of mind was concerned. Of course, he was quick enough to perceive them, to estimate them, to handle them, to place them. He was on the alert to deal with them; he was acutely sensitive to the exact points at which they touched his position. But he never enjoyed them for their own sake. Reason to him was a tool, a weapon, a talent committed in charge; but hardly a life. And, perhaps, in saying all this, we can relieve Mr. Frederic Harrison of his wonder how any one, with a mind so unelastic, could have had such immense influence. As with the humorist, so with the orator and the preacher, a fixed intellectual base is an incomparable gain. The preachers who produce the deepest effect are those who, having fast hold of the elemental religious principles which their hearers already hold, but hold hesitatingly, or hold as in a dream, or hold without knowing what they hold, drags these out from the darkness in which they lie buried, or forces them into activity, and vividly manifests the reality of their application to heart and conduct. That is what moves men so profoundly; they come to church professing a creed, they hope that they believe it; but it slumbers, inoperative and inert, without practical force, without any direct or effectual significance. The preacher reads out the secret; he takes up this assumed creed; he gives it actual meaning; he spreads it out over the surface of life; he brings it to bear on the real facts of daily conduct with incision and with fire.

Now, in all this Liddon was supreme. Unelastic in his intellectual framework, he was eminently elastic in every other field of life—in sympathy, in imagination, in affection, in sensibility, in logical acuteness, in mental alertness, in modes of expression, in turns of feeling. Here, all was motion, rapidity, change. No one could appreciate a situation with a finer or more delicate intuition; no one could exhibit a more subtle variety of temperament, a more spontaneous identification of himself with the shifting needs of the moment. Here, he would "become all things to all men"; he would understand everything in a flash, the meaning would be caught up and expressed with pre-eminent happiness of insight. Thus he had the double gift of the preacher. He impressed, he overawed, he mastered, by the sense of unshaken solidity which his mental characteristics assured to him. Men felt the force of a position which was as a rock amid the surging seas. Here was the fixity, the security, the eternal reassurance most needed by those who wondered sadly whether the sands under their feet were shifty or no. And yet, at the service of this unmoving creed was a brain, a heart, alive with infinite motion, abounding in rich variety, fertile, resourceful, quickening, expansive, vital.

And, if we add to this a strong will, possessed of unswerving courage, and utterly fearless of the world, we shall see that there was in him all the elements that constitute a great Director of Souls. For such a function he had just the right combination of gifts—rigid and decisive spiritual principles, applied to the details of life with all the pliability of a sympathetic imagination and of illuminative affection. The moment he entered the sphere of personal relations, his intense honor for each soul in its separateness, his exquisite courtesy, his unfailing tenderness, his eager unselfishness, his perfect simplicity, all served to temper and correct the rigidities of his intellectual formulæ. It must remain to us a matter of poignant regret that he persisted in a strange and invincible refusal to undertake Retreats, for which he had shown, in early days at Cuddesdon, quite a peculiar aptitude, and for which he seemed obviously endowed with every qualification that could be desired.* He was a priest to the core of cores—a priest by nature as well as by grace. Already, as a boy, he moved about as a priest, among the rest, we are told. Instinctively he bent all to edification; instinctively he wore the names of others on his breast. I can hardly imagine any one who would surpass him in conducting a Clerical Retreat. He had all the strength and the gentleness, which, in union with his fine spiritual insight, would have ranked him, so far as we can judge, among the masters of the Spiritual Life. Yet, in spite of reiterated entreaties, he abstained from all such opportunities; he resolutely declared himself unfitted. He confined himself to private ministrations, to interviews, to letter-writing, holding himself, indeed, entirely at the mercy of correspondents, and keeping his door open to all who came there for counsel and good cheer.

I have attempted to show how unique was the position of him whom we have lost. And such as this he has been for twenty-five years. There was nobody at all to challenge his particular position. That position was historically noticeable, in that, apart from his own personal eminence as a preacher and theologian, he served to bind the later Ritualistic movement to the old Tractarian centre. What we call "Ritualism" only means the effort to diffuse over the parish life of town and country that which the Tractarians had revived and secured in the University. This diffusion carried the movement far afield; it had to make adventurous experiments, often in young hands, under rough and irregular conditions. It might have got quite out of hand. And then, of course, the children of those who had stoned Tractarianism were now ready to glorify their old foe at the expense of their new and swarming enemy. They spoke of the academic dignity, of the illustrious learning, of the lofty intellectual calibre, of the great leaders of Tractarianism. This was safe enough now that most of those, who had not long ago gone over to Rome, were beginning to grow old and to die. They scornfully contrasted with these great names the unknown crowd of clergy, fervent but ignorant, who were spreading the new movement in lanes and slums. They were rash; they were reckless; they were silly. The movement, once so dignified, was vulgarized. So men complained; and it was everything that, at such a moment, there should be a personality like Liddon's in absolute touch with the new men, in fullest sympathy with all that they were attempting, and yet himself lodged tight and fast in honorable places of the old University—a professor, a theologian, a unique figure in its pulpit; and moreover, one to whom the outside public was compelled to listen with respect; who had a reputation which told on the imagination of the world at large. Thus, in binding the earlier and later stages of the Church movement together, Liddon, who was at once in the intimate and affectionate confidence of the great academic chief who still worked and prayed in the corner of the great quadrangle at Christ Church, and the greatest power in the pulpit at St. Mary's—and yet had also been the fellow-curate of Mackonochie at Wantage, and had, as Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon, inspired the very men who were doing the Catholic work in street and field—Liddon was, for the last twenty-five years, of incalculable importance to the Church.

And it was in bridging these significant years by the force of a most noticeable personality that he told, too, upon us, the younger brood at Oxford, to whom he gave himself in such simple and delightful familiarity. He introduced into our midst the intensity, the fibre, the moral toughness of the older Tractarians. He had their rigorous unworldliness, their unflinching courage, their disciplined self-repression, their definite and masterful direction, their spiritual beauty, their unearthly force. We, on the other hand, had come under many influences which were wholly foreign to all under which the older movement grew. The currents of thought that fed the education of the day had been changed. The English utilitarianism had yielded to the sway of speculative floods, which had been set moving in German Universities. These influences had gone very deep in us; they had passed into our innermost habits of reasoning; they had dyed our mental moods. Their pressure had fallen upon us just at an age when we were most receptive. We could not but be moulded and penetrated by them. The result was inevitable. Much to which Liddon had closed the door instinctively was already inside us by the very conditions of our growth. We had offered ourselves to it at an age when every door and window in us was as wide open as it could bear to be. We had therefore absorbed, according to our abilities, that which he held at arm's-length with suspicion and repugnance. This could not but tell in matters of Christian *Apology*. We had imbibed another logical temper from his; we could not approach a problem by his method, nor deal with it according to his measures. Others of his generation, and, above all, one still living of the generation older than his, whom it is needless to name, had, in all such matters, drawn much nearer to us than he. He resolutely kept himself aloof from the influences that had entered the modern life and had changed its intellectual temper.

---

* *Cf.* R. Randall, "Retreat Addresses," Preface, p. xi.

This could not but be a sorrow; but yet it remained that, by different routes, we arrived at the same goal. Our conclusion was his conclusion. For still, it was "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." Still, it was the doctrine of the Incarnation, as witnessed by Church and Scripture, which was the sum and substance of all our apology. All his positive vital convictions were ours also. And here he brought to bear upon us the authoritative correction which we, in our littleness, most needed. For we were shaken and confused by the new powers that had taken hold of the intellectual life. We were staggering about; we were often lifted off our feet. We were weaklings caught in a strong stream. And it was everything to have before us one who gave us a standard of what spiritual conviction should mean; one who never cringed, or shrank, or compromised, or slid; one who looked unswervingly on the eternal things; one who was evidence to us of what the sacraments of the Incarnation could work in those who were yielded to them in body, soul, and spirit; one who had committed his all to the dominion and service of Christ, "casting down before it all reasonings and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." There he was; there was no mistaking him. He would die gladly for his creed; we felt it; we knew it; and it shamed us and braced us just when shame and bracing were most needful.

Ah! and then, on the common ground of his and our positive conviction, he gave us everything that was exhilarating and attractive in personal intimacy. He drew us with the cords of a man. He communed with us freely, with that most joyful and blessed communion of mind and heart which is impossible except for those who walk together in the same house of God as friends.

Only to those who came within the warmth and security of a common faith could be set free all the glowing fervors and the most radiant fascinations of his personal character. But to them everything was opened with the most winning freedom and in the richest abundance. To the very last it was the same. The bond held fast, however annoying and erratic we became. Never did I find him more buoyantly at ease, more brimming with confidential mirth and playful affection, than when I met him at Oxford on the Sunday before his final illness.

He was the most beautiful of friends. It is the loss of this that has taken so much sunlight from our days, and has made our daily life feel so beggared and so thin. Often and often in the years to come we shall turn, by happy habit, to feel it at hand, only to remember with a fresh touch of sadness that God has taken from us that presence that was so beautiful and so dear.

"All our days we shall go softlier, sadlier," as those who are aware that a glory has gone from their life; yet as those who, from the very bottom of their hearts, give thanks to the Lord and Saviour Who has him in good keeping, that it was once their honor and their joy to know and to love Henry Parry Liddon.

SOME ASPECTS OF NEWMAN'S INFLUENCE.

BY WILFRID WARD.

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), October, 1890.

It has probably struck many persons that the general feeling of enthusiasm displayed on the occasion of Cardinal Newman's death has been quite out of proportion to the extent to which he or his writings are known. The thought that a great man has passed away, a high example of unworldliness been taken from us, has possessed many who felt and knew little more than this. It used to be said that the great Duke of Wellington's influence for good while he lived was immense, even on those who knew nothing of him except that a great example of English courage and English sense of duty was still among us. And in the sphere of spiritual life Newman had a similar influence.

The consequence has been, however, in the case of Cardinal Newman, that many who have written and spoken of him with genuine feeling—to whom the knowledge that the author of *Lead, kindly Light*, still lived and prayed at Birmingham was a real source of spiritual strength—have given a very imperfect account of the man himself. There have indeed been not a few beautiful sketches by personal friends and admirers. But he has also been described, both in print and in conversation, by epithets which have struck those who knew anything of his writings or himself with a sense of their incompleteness and unsatisfactoriness. "Mystic," "giant controversialist," "learned theologian," "recluse"—such descriptions have seemed little nearer the mark than the discoveries of the few who have found fault, and have noted that he lacked imagination, and that his style was in some respects inferior to that of Mr. Stevenson.

And yet perhaps the failure to characterise him rightly has arisen, in some cases, from the difficulty of the task—from the complexity of his nature. "Prose-poet" gives a fair description of Carlyle; "A great thinker in verse" is the true account of Browning by an able critic; but a many-sided genius like Newman's refuses to be explained or even suggested in a few words. And when we ask ourselves *why* we are dissatisfied with the epithets in question, it is not easy in a moment to give the reasons. The descriptions contain some truth. There was in him something of the mystic. He was full of power in controversy. His mind had been absorbed in patristic theology. His life was one of seclusion. Yet these epithets, singly or collectively, quite fail to give any idea of him, or of the nature of his influence. We remember the story of the Buddhist who was asked to describe "Nirvana." "Was it annihilation?" "No," he answered impatiently. "Was it the beatific vision of the great unknown?" "No," with equal impatience, and so on with further queries. "What was it then?" "How can you ask what is so plain? . . . Nirvana is . . . *Nirvana*." And so in the present case. "Not a theologian, not a mystic, not a controversialist. Newman was *Newman*."

However, as many have succeeded in bringing out *some* at least of those distinctive elements which are felt in their combination by the majority of his readers, it may be worth while for each, according to his lights, to put his mite in contribution. Let us look through the phrases I have cited and attempt to limit their "connotation" as applied to Newman.

"Mystic!" Yes; he had a keen hold on the unseen world, on the mysterious teachings of conscience, on the shadow of God's presence in the human heart, and of God's wrath in the world at large. But the typical mystic lives in the clouds. He is not in touch with things around him. He is little interested in the microscopic inspection of the play of life about him. And what is to be said of the Cardinal from this point of view? He loved to talk on current topics of the day. "He was interested," says J. A. Froude, speaking of his Oxford days, "in everything which was going on in science, in politics, in literature." He could throw himself into spheres of action far removed from his own. "What do you think," a friend asked, "of Gurwood's *Despatches of the Duke of Wellington?*" "Think?" he replied; "they make one burn to have been a soldier!" His senses were keenly alive to the small things of earth. How delicately he weighs in *Loss and Gain* the respective attractions of sights, scents, and sounds! Ascetic though he was, he chose the wines for his college cellar at Oriel. Vivid and real as was the world of religious mystery to him, he could give the closest attention to matters of secular detail. He could, in a moment, pass from the greatest matters to the smallest. Gregory the Great left his audience with ambassadors to teach the Roman choristers the notes of the "plain song;" and so, too, Newman would leave the atmosphere of religious thought and meditation and betake himself to his violin. He is still remembered by the villagers at Littlemore as teaching them hymn-tunes in their boyhood.[*] It was a recreation to him in later life to coach the Oratory boys for the *Pincerna*[†] or the *Aulularia.* He delighted in Miss Austen and Anthony Trollope. He enjoyed a good story from *Pickwick.* All this limits very much the popular idea of the word "mystic"; and yet all this is true of the man whose sense of religious mystery was surpassed by few.

"Giant controversialist!" Certainly the original edition of the *Apologia,* the *Letter* in answer to Pusey's *Eirenicon,* and the *Lectures on Anglican Difficulties* are masterpieces of religious controversy; and yet we can fancy the Cardinal smiling quietly if he heard himself spoken of as a "giant controversialist." "Tell me what books to read on such a subject," an old pupil asked him. "Why do you ask me?" was the answer; "I know nothing about books." How—we can see it in every page of his works—he hated the pedantry and parade of controversy! He would help inquirers, but he cared not to do the work of sledge-hammer argument. If it was done it was done for the sake of his friends and of anxious seekers after truth, and not for the sake of opponents whom he had no hope of convincing. He believed in the proverb, "He who is convinced against his will is of the same opinion still." He said fifty years ago that if views were clearly stated and candidly recognised, all controversy would be either superfluous or useless—superfluous to those whose first principles agreed, useless to those who differed fundamentally.[‡] With him, controversy was chiefly exposition and the pointing out of mis-statements. There was little of direct argument. "Giant controversialist!" One can fancy the fate—there are stories on record as to the fate—of the pompous man who went to talk to him of controversy, as one great controversialist to another. One specimen of the class comes with notes, and books, and points for discussion on problems of education, but finds the Cardinal so absorbed with news about the "barley crop" in Norfolk that no other subject seems to interest him. Another presses him for a refutation of one of Mr. Gladstone's arguments against the Vatican decrees, but only succeeds in eliciting the reply that Mr. Gladstone is an old Oxford acquaintance, and has been very kind to him. Or, if the subject is insisted on, the conversation suddenly passes—his visitor knows not how—to the oaks of Hawarden and the exercise of cutting down trees. A third visitor finds himself engaged *in limine* in a discussion as to the number of stoppages in the 1.30 train as contrasted with the 3.40, and has unexpectedly to employ his conversational talent in explaining his cross-country route, and the lines by which he came. And then there is the Oxford story of Newman's guest who introduces the "origin of evil" at dinner, and at once produces a dissertation—full of exact knowledge, and apparently delivered with earnest interest—as to the different ways of treating hot-house grapes, and the history of the particular grapes on the table before him. Such are the stories, partly legends perhaps, which are current. Not that really anxious inquirers who approached him with tact could ever have such a tale to tell; with them he took infinite pains. But where the pomp of controversy was invoked by tactless or self-sufficient persons, he remembered the proverb, "Answer a fool according to his folly."

And what of "learned theologian"? An unquestionable truth; yet we cannot help seeing the Cardinal's smile again. Who that has read it can forget the irony of his description of the typical learned man, the historian, or archæologist, or theologian, whose learning has overgrown and stiffened the freedom of his mind? It expresses the half-restrained irritation—half irritation, half amusement—of Cardinal Newman himself after a two hours' walk and talk with Mr. Casaubon. It may be read in a lecture delivered at Dublin, and is, perhaps, so little known as to be worth writing down here.

> Such readers are only possessed by their knowledge, not possessed of it; nay, in matter of fact they are often even carried away by it, without any volition of their own. Recollect, the memory can tyrannise as well as the imagination. Derangement, I believe, has been considered as a loss of control over the sequence of ideas. The mind, once set in motion, is henceforth deprived of the power of initiation, and becomes the victim of a train of associations, one thought suggesting another, in the way of cause and effect, as if by a mechanical process, or some physical necessity. No one who has had experience of men of studious habits but must recognise the existence of a parallel phenomenon in the case of those who have over-stimulated the memory. In such persons reason acts almost as feebly and as impotently as in the madman: once fairly started on any subject whatever, they have no power of self-control; they passively endure the succession of impulses which are evolved out of the original exciting cause; they are passed on from one idea to another, and go steadily forward, plodding along one line of thought in spite of the amplest concessions of the hearer, or wandering from it in endless digression

---

[*] *Guardian*, Sept. 3, p. 1,358.

[†] The *Pincerna* was Newman's expurgated version of the *Eunuchus.*

[‡] Cf. *University Sermons*, pp. 200, 201.

in spite of his remonstrances. Now, if, as is very certain, no one would envy the madman the glow and originality of his conceptions, why must we extol the cultivation of that intellect which is the prey, not indeed of barren fancies, but of barren facts, of random intrusions from without, though not of morbid imaginations from within? And, in thus speaking, I am not denying that a strong and ready memory is in itself a real treasure; I am not disparaging a well-stored mind, though it be nothing besides, so that it be sober, any more than I would despise a bookseller's shop—it is of great value to others even when not so to the owner. Nor am I banishing—far from it—the possessors of deep and multifarious learning from my ideal university; they adorn it in the eyes of men: I do but say that they constitute no type of the results at which it aims; that it is no great gain to the intellect to have enlarged the memory at the expense of faculties which are indisputably higher.

Once more—"recluse!" He lived in the Oratory and saw little or nothing of the world. But where were the gloominess, the sternness, the unsociableness which the word suggests? As has been well said by a recent writer, his need of loneliness was fully balanced by his need of friendship. *Cor ad cor loquitur* was his motto, and it expressed the man. He loved to unbend among familiar friends. His sense of humour was of the keenest. His life-long habit, formed at Oxford, of living in intimacy with those whose objects were his objects, and who loved and understood him, had become to him a second nature. True, he despised the vanity of society. He felt the heartlessness of the world and withdrew from it. But he withdrew from the world only to give himself more fully to his friends. With his brilliancy and fastidiousness it might have been expected that the ideal of the best society, its exclusiveness and its refinement, would in early days have had some attraction for him (so at least the late Canon Mozley seems to hint); but there was in him a far deeper force which made him shun all that approached to dissipation of mind, and put away all that savoured of ambition. But it was not in the spirit of a hermit. The sternness of a recluse, the austerity of his demeanour, the marked protest against the rest of the world which the conception conveys, were uncongenial to him. He was like his own St. Philip Neri. An intimate friend of his has lately written on his "naturalness," on the simplicity with which he laughed at his own failures—"his floors," as he called them. Though his natural refinement was intense, there was no trace of anything artificial or of unreal reserve. "A. B. is a man one can't talk to in one's shirt sleeves," he would complain. Just as the abstraction of the mystic was not his, nor the pedantry of the controversialist, so the pronounced *rôle* of a recluse was foreign to his nature. He loved to be as other men. His prayer for himself and his friends was, he said, not for those heavy trials some saints have asked for—persecution, calumny, reproach—but simply that they might be overlooked, passed over as members of the crowd.*

And thus we get from the limits which must be placed on the meaning of "mystic," "controversialist," "learned theologian," "recluse," as applied to Newman, a glimpse of one aspect of his distinctive charm—a kind of social charm rare in all classes, especially rare in one whose life-work is greatly that of the student. Men of letters and men of science are often known to men of the world as "book-worms," or regarded with distaste and some alarm as "very *learned.*" And with a certain amount of ignorance implied in the tone of such unsympathetic judgments there is a bit of truth in them. Such men are often eccentric, and are wanting in the sense of humour which should teach them to avoid talking "shop," and to find common ground of converse with the rest of the world. Newman was the antithesis to the "book-worm" or the "learned man" as conceived by the man of the world. Full though he was of knowledge gained by observation and reading, he could and did put it entirely aside on occasion. He valued intercourse with his fellows more than mere study as a means of improvement. "Given the alternative," he once said, "in a University, of social life without study, or study without social life, I should unhesitatingly declare for the former, not the latter." † Life was for action, and action was determined by character. All his intellectual efforts were guided and limited by this thought. His sermons, his lectures, his philosophy at Oxford were all designed to meet the practical difficulties of those to whom he was a spiritual father. There was no rhetoric for rhetoric's sake; he never preached abstract dogma except as helping the spiritual life, nor philosophy as a speculative science, but solely as a practical help to those in doubt.

And this brings me to another point which I can only touch on briefly. The word "philosopher" has been used of him less often than the epithets I have referred to. It has been used by some of the best critics; yet it has been, by implication, denied by men who were in close contact with him. Dean Stanley in his well-known estimate of the Oxford movement never once refers to the Oxford University sermons which were at that time the embodiment of Newman's philosophy. And one who opens these sermons will find nothing in the form of a philosophical treatise; nothing about the origin of ideas, about the categories, about the distinction between the pure and the practical reason. Yet those men of acute and religious mind who went to hear him, in doubt and trouble as to man's right to confident belief in the very being of a God and in the hope of immortality, came away reassured. Does philosophy require a formal and technical treatise, completely elaborated, on the human faculties and on metaphysics? If so, Newman was no philosopher. Is he a philosopher who takes in at a glance the root-problems as to what practical beliefs are reasonable in matters of deepest moment to each individual; who treats these problems in such a way as to help those in need, the deepest thinkers if so be; who treats them informally, suggestively, incompletely, seldom using technical language; who almost professes that he is not philosophising but only reminding us of the asseverations of sober common sense; who refrains from entering on questions which cannot help the action of practical life, but who gives to more systematic writers the groundwork, if they care to build on it, of a philosophy of faith, unsurpassed for breadth and depth, which he refrains from fully elaborating himself? If such a man is a philosopher—a religious philosopher—Newman was a great philosopher. His philosophy was like the rest of his work, the expression of his personality. It was the expression of his own deep reflections, as they came to him; of answers almost as he would have given them in conversation. When a conclusion was obvious he had not the pedantry to draw it. Where it would offend some and help others, again he would not draw it. He gave the materials for it which would be of service to the one class; he refrained from making the statement which would scare the other. Where a professional philosopher would press for a logical explanation, he would perhaps suddenly "shut up," and break off an argument which had really done its work, and pass on to something else instead of engaging in fruitless logomachy. When he had shown in the *Grammar of Assent* some of the strongest instances of clear and confident religious conclusions, which certain minds attain to without recognising more than mere suggestions of their real premises, he foresaw the indignant objections of the incurable logician. But he had really said enough for his purpose, which was to show that such inferences in untrained minds may be practically reliable, and that was sufficient. He did not want to argue with the logician, he wanted to satisfy the simple mind that it was on the right road. So instead of an elaborate answer we find the following words: "Should it be objected that this is an illogical exercise of reason, I answer that since it actually brings them to a right conclusion, and was intended to bring them to it, if logic finds fault with it so much the worse for logic."*

---

* *Sermons on Various Occasions*, p. 241.

† This sentiment is also expressed in the *Idea of a University*, 2nd edition, p. 205.

In a similar spirit—though this is not an instance from his philosophy—when years ago he had strung together a *catena* of Catholic doctrines from Bull, Andrewes, and other Anglican divines, old Oxford men relate how he foresaw the objection, "But other passages from them tell a different tale." This opens an endless argument on Anglican inconsistency—endless and hopeless It was enough for him to have got a rough *catena*—enough for the past, as much as could possibly be expected. He had never thought, as more sanguine men had, that Anglican tradition could be proved consistent; all he hoped was to show a tradition feeble enough at times, damaged by Protestant influences, yet never actually broken. Let the future be consistent. Let the dead past bury its dead. But he could not say all this in hearing of the Puseys and Palmers who thought otherwise. He must not break up his party by his own pessimism. So he gave this characteristic reply: "To say this is to accuse them of inconsistency, which I leave it for their enemies to do."

And so on throughout. What Döllinger styled Newman's "subjectivity" in philosophy, though the present writer does not believe that it diminishes the real objective value of his thought, was, in the sense of personal element, most marked. A recent critic has spoken of the *Grammar of Assent* as a treatise showing how things may be taken for granted. There cannot be a greater mistake, though the subjective mode of expression in some passages partly accounts for it. Newman shows that all begin with first principles which cannot be logically proven. He sees in himself religious first principles of which his nature assures him. He sees that those who cry out "You are taking them for granted" are themselves assuming a number of other first principles. A man who denies that human nature is normally Christian assumes it to be something different. He starts with one conception of human nature as the Christian starts with another. A man who denies that conscience reveals sin, in the Christian sense of the word, *starts* with his own different impression of what conscience conveys, and proceeds to account for his impression as being due to an offence against society, or against law, or to an inherited feeling resulting from past experiences of general utility. Cardinal Newman's conclusion is not "We all assume unwarrantably," but rather, "*You* say I assume; I can at once retort *you* assume, but in fact I do *not* assume; I see with certainty." * Or, as he expressed it in a letter to myself written during his last years, "The religious mind must always master much which is *unseen* to the non-religious. . . . I can't allow that a religious man has no more evidence necessarily than a non-religious." †

---

* *Grammar of Assent*, 5th edition, p. 403.

The contrast between the arbitrary assumptions of the Agnostic and the first principles which a religious mind adopts rightly and with certainty, and the tests whereby they may be distinguished, were subjects which exercised his mind, as we see from his last publication in 1885, on *The Development of Religious Error*, to the very evening of life. But it would carry me too far to attempt here an analysis of that essay.

The personal element then, both in style and in matter, is most prominent. In the former it is the result of his object and his method, of helping others by his own personal influence, and by putting *himself* before them. In the latter it is on the principle which he maintains, that "egotism is true modesty." A strong man in fully revealing his own mind—its struggles and its victories—aids weaker minds in time of trial and difficulty.

Briefly it may be said that two points give the key to much of his work and influence, whether in philosophy, or in preaching, or in religious controversy, or in the guidance of individual consciences:—the power over others of his personality, and the exercise of that power with absolute simplicity to make men better than he found them. And as the peculiar power of his personality was that it appealed to such different minds, so, according to the bent and genius of each, his influence as a whole was most various. His was not simply a spiritual influence, as John Wesley's; not merely that of the dry light of philosophy, as Kant's, or Coleridge's in our own country; nor of a brilliant converser and critic, as Johnson's; nor of intellectual and imaginative power, as Carlyle's; nor of the religious poet, as Keble's; nor of the Christian counsellor to the men and women of the world, as Fénélon's or St. Francis of Sales'. It was to each man one or more of these kinds of influence; and thus it was to all a combination of them.

Some of the most remarkable published testimonies to his early power over others come from men as different from each other as Mr. J. A. Froude, Principal Shairp, Dean Church, and Mr. Mark Pattison. While he influenced intellectualists like Pattison and Froude, and men of high mental gifts like Church, intellect was not in the least a necessary qualification for the most intimate friendship with him. This fact, which aroused Mark Pattison's supercilious contempt, was part of Newman's peculiar strength. Littlemore was no assemblage of intellectual lights; it was a community of religious and devoted friends—some, as Dalgairns, men of special mental gifts, others not so. Men living in the great world also, taking part in politics or public life, leant on him and appealed to him, as well as those whose life was in abstract thought or religious seclusion. To mention only a few and life-long friends, Lord Blachford, Lord Emly, and Mr. Hope Scott were as thorough in their personal allegiance to him as Dr. Pusey or the present Dean of St. Paul's. He himself has described that assemblage of qualities which constitute the perfection of University refinement, which make up the idea of a "gentleman," if not exactly in the popular English sense, still in the highest sense of the perfection of the intellectual and social nature.* He tells us that men may have those qualities and yet not be Christians; or they may have them and use the attractiveness they give simply for good. "They may subserve the education," he writes, "of a St. Francis of Sales or a Cardinal Pole; they may be the limits of the virtue of a Shaftesbury or a Gibbon. Basil and Julian were fellow students at the schools of Athens; and one became a Saint and Doctor of the Church, the other her scoffing and relentless foe." Newman had the qualities he describes,—they were a great part of his magnetism; they pervaded his writing and his conversation; and he used the influence they gave as St. Francis or Basil would have used them, but with greater variety of gifts than either, and over a more heterogeneous collection of disciples.

---

* Cf. *Development of Religious Error*, p. 459.

† The Cardinal gave me permission in 1885 to make public use of any part of this letter, which is mostly a discussion on the nature of religious knowledge.

* The well-known description I refer to comes in *Idea of a University*, 2nd edition, pp. 305-9.

Beginning, then, at Oxford among young men, his equals in age many of them, passing into the comparative obscurity of the Birmingham Oratory, living there unseen by the world at large, holding for many years no position of official importance, his personality, in a manner so subtle that it is hard fully to account for it, made itself felt over the whole country. Leading the simple consistent life of a priest, ever ready to help those who came to him or wrote to him for advice, shunning the crowd, welcoming each individual, helping each according to his character to love God and to realise the true end of life, never seeking influence for his own sake, thinking only of those he was helping, grateful for their trust, but deeply feeling its sacredness before God and his responsibility for the use he made of it, throwing himself into the position of each of those who consulted him as if each were the only one, he gained steadily in immediate influence as life went on; while the power of good done, and of a devoted life, as a witness to the unseen world, made its way to the crowds who form public opinion. It would be hard to estimate the number of those who have sought his help, during the last forty years, on their road to the Catholic Church; and many more have been guided by him in other matters. In his measure, and allowing for the difference of gifts and circumstances, he carried out the kind of work done by his own St. Philip, which early in his Catholic life he had spoken of as the only work he had a call to do. The Cardinal's chief instruments were writing and correspondence, the Saint chose direct conversation; but the spirit of the work was the same in both cases. As St. Philip, by his love for those who leant upon him, and by his personal character, drew all men to him for guidance and advice, winning respect and esteem from Jews and Infidels as well as members of the Church, so did Newman, by the power of his personality, find himself the centre of influence among vast numbers, priests and laymen, non-Catholics as well as Catholics. The simple priest was by the popular voice called Apostle of Rome; the English Oratorian was, as a representative critic has expressed it, canonised at his death by the voice of the English people.

"Whether or not," he wrote early in his Catholic life, "I can do anything at all in St. Philip's way, at least I can do nothing in any other. Neither by my habits of life, nor by vigour of age, am I fitted for the task of authority, or of rule, or of initiation." And what was St. Philip's way? Let us read his own beautiful account of it. It describes his aspiration in 1852; it describes the spirit of his work done in the Catholic Church forty years later.

> He lived in an age as traitorous to the interests of Catholicism as any that preceded it, or can follow it. He lived at a time when pride mounted high, and the senses held rule; a time when kings and nobles never had more of state and homage, and never less of personal responsibility and peril; when mediæval winter was receding, and the summer sun of civilisation was bringing into leaf and flower a thousand forms of luxurious enjoyment; when a new world of thought and beauty had opened upon the human mind, in the discovery of the treasures of classic literature and art. He saw the great and the gifted, dazzled by the Enchantress, and drinking in the magic of her song; he saw the high and the wise, the student and the artist, painting, and poetry, and sculpture, and music, and architecture, drawn within her range and circling round the abyss; he saw heathen forms mounting thence, and forming in the thick air:—all this he saw, and he perceived that the mischief was to be met, not with argument, not with science, not with protests and warnings, not by the recluse or the preacher, but by means of the great counter-fascination of purity and truth.
>
> He was raised up to do a work almost peculiar in the Church: not to be a Jerome Savonarola, though Philip had a true devotion toward him and a tender memory of his Florentine house; not to be a St. Carlo, though in his beaming countenance Philip had recognised the aureole of a saint; not to be a St. Ignatius, wrestling with the foe, though Philip was termed the Society's bell of call, so many subjects did he send to it; not to be a St. Francis Xavier, though Philip had longed to shed his blood for Christ in India with him; not to be a St. Caietan, or hunter of souls, for Philip preferred, as he expressed it, tranquilly to cast in his net to gain them; he preferred to yield to the stream, and direct the current—which he could not stop—of science, literature, art, and fashion, and to sweeten and to sanctify what God had made very good and man had spoilt.
>
> And so he contemplated as the idea of his mission, not the propagation of the faith, nor the exposition of doctrine, nor the catechetical schools: whatever was exact and systematic pleased him not; he put from him monastic rule and authoritative speech, as David refused the armour of his king. No; he would be but an ordinary individual priest as others, and his weapons should be but unaffected humility and unpretending love. All he did was to be done by the light, and fervour, and convincing eloquence of his personal character and his easy conversation. He came to the Eternal City and he sat himself down there, and his home and his family gradually grew up around him, by the spontaneous accession of materials from without. He did not so much seek his own as draw them to him. He sat in his small room, and they in their gay worldly dresses, the rich and well-born as well as the simple and illiterate, crowded into it. In the mid-heats of summer, in the frosts of winter, still was he in that low and narrow cell at San

> Girolamo, reading the hearts of those who came to him, and curing their souls' maladies by the very touch of his hand. . . .
>
> In the words of his biographer, "he was all things to all men. He suited himself to noble and ignoble, young and old, subjects and prelates, learned and ignorant, and received those who were strangers to him with singular benignity, and embraced them with as much love and charity as if he had been a long while expecting them. When he was called upon to be merry he was so: if there was a demand upon his sympathy he was equally ready. He gave the same welcome to all, caressing the poor equally with the rich, and wearying himself to assist all to the utmost limits of his power. In consequence of his being so accessible and willing to receive all comers many went to him every day, and some continued for the space of thirty, nay, forty years, to visit him very often both morning and evening, so that his room went by the agreeable nickname of the Home of Christian mirth. Nay, people came to him not only from all parts of Italy, but from France, Spain, Germany, and all Christendom; and even the Infidels and Jews who had ever any communication with him revered him as a holy man." The first families of Rome, the Massimi, the Aldobrandini, the Colonna, the Altieri, the Vitelleschi, were his friends and his penitents. Nobles of Poland, grandees of Spain, knights of Malta, could not leave Rome without coming to him. Cardinals, archbishops and bishops were his intimates: Federigo Boromeo haunted his room and got the name of "Father Philip's soul." The Cardinal-Archbishops of Verona and Bologna wrote books in his honour. Pope Pius the Fourth died in his arms. Lawyers, painters, musicians, physicians, it was the same too with them. Baronius, Zazzara, and Ricci left the law at his bidding and joined his congregation, to do its work, to write the annals of the Church, and to die in the odour of sanctity. Palestrina had Father Philip's ministrations in his last moments. Animuccia hung about him during life, sent him a message after death, and was conducted by him through Purgatory to Heaven. And who was he, I say, all the while, but an humble priest, a stranger in Rome, with no distinction of family or letters, no claim of station or of office, great simply in the attraction with which a Divine Power had gifted him? And yet thus humble, thus un-ennobled, thus empty-handed, he has achieved the glorious title of Apostle of Rome.

And, in drawing to a conclusion, the present writer feels how much he has not even touched on which was essential to the Cardinal's influence. That unique gift which made one who was no orator the greatest preacher of his age; his faithfulness to his friends—"faithful and true," as he loved to say of Our Lord; his power of resentment of injury done to those he loved, or to his cause; the attractiveness which came of his sensitiveness, even of over-sensitiveness; the combination of far-seeing and dispassionate wisdom with keen and quickly-roused emotion; his tenderness for and sympathy with the distressed in faith, which made others even fear, at times, lest, in meeting them half-way, he was losing sight of the very principles he was in reality protecting; the very "defects of his qualities," which his closest friends loved almost as they did his virtues—which made him so truly human amid his greatness; these were all part of him, though this is not the time or place to speak of them fully. But the thought of them makes me fall back upon the description with which I began as the only true one, that as Nirvana is Nirvana, so Newman was Newman.

THE JEWS IN RUSSIA.

BY E. B. LANIN.

From *The Fortnightly Review* (London), October, 1890.

> Something is wrong, there needeth change.
> But what or where?"
>
> *Song of Rabbi Ben Ezra.*

It has often been a matter of wonder to me that in these days of rapid communications, "private wires," special correspondents and international journalism, so very little should be known and so very much rashly written in this country about Russia. France, Germany, and England are perhaps equally guilty of this crime of *lèse-majesté* against reason—their writers and politicians forming and expressing confident opinions about important questions, without the slightest foundation in fact,—and Englishmen have not quite so much reason to blush as their neighbours, seeing that they are but a little less familiar with the economical, intellectual, and moral condition of a foreign and not over friendly people than with that of their own kith and kin in the colonies. A more serious excuse might perhaps be found in the circumstance that the press of the country rather than its readers should bear the blame of ignorance which is, in many cases, equalled only by conceit; as it is the press that furnishes the so-called facts, solemnly pledging itself to their accuracy, while the public can no more be condemned for not sifting them critically than a bookkeeper can be blamed for not spending his time in verifying the statements of his ready-reckoner. Thus a few months ago *The Times*, through its correspondent, informed its readers that Madam Tsebrikoff had been exiled to Pensa in the Caucasus, whither she was being driven in a *kibitka*, thus giving circulation to a statement containing about as much truth and meaning as if a Russian journal of the same day had announced that Mr. Davitt had been imprisoned by the Irish Secretary in the frightful prison of Sing Sing, in Tipperary.

Two months ago a "well-informed" and "widely circulated" paper assured its readers that a new and barbarous law had just been passed in Russia, the practical effect of which was to doom the unfortunate Jews of that country to exile or death; and this caterer for political information for the million was so well informed of what was passing in "higher spheres" in Russia, that he was able to quote textually several clauses of the new law, the mere perusal of which reminded Englishmen—who had begun to grow as tired of Stanley as of the fasting man—of the halcyon days of Bulgarian horrors. And it needed several weeks of the most solemn assurances of the Russian Government to allay an excitement that ought either never to have been roused or to have made itself felt to some good purpose some years ago.[*]

As a matter of fact, no project of law ever passes the Imperial Council in June, July, or August, because there are no sittings of that body all through the summer months, and consequently the statement of the correspondent could not have deceived any one who had any real knowledge of Russia. Moreover, it has never been a serious question, with those who govern the Russian Empire, of banishing the Jews *en masse,* as they were expelled from Spain in 1492. A portion of the Russian press has, it is true, often advocated this drastic method of dealing with them, but the press has less effect on the Government than the scarcely audible buzz of the tiny fly struggling in the web on the callous spider that eyes it coldly from on high.

On the other hand, it would be a grave mistake to suppose that because the Russian Government goes methodically to work, judiciously blending cunning with cruelty, patience with hatred, the lot of the Jews is an enviable one; just as it would be wrong to conclude that, because prisoners in Russia are often treated with more revolting cruelty than African slaves, the movement now on foot to put an end to the slave-trade in Africa has therefore lost its *raison d'être.* How far the lot of the Russian Jews will enlist the sympathies of Englishmen is in truth of very scant importance to any one; to what extent it deserves those sympathies may perhaps appear from a simple statement of the case.

In the olden times of the Grand Duchy of Moscow there was no Jewish question to disturb the peace of mind of Russian statesmen: the peaceful Jews were then kept out of the country more successfully than the martial Tartars, more resolutely than the plague. Every Jew found there was seized and expelled,[*] no reason, however weighty, being accepted as sufficient to justify the pollution of the land by the presence of a member of the race that crucified the Saviour. And thus the native population were left to their own devices—the stream of Russian civilisation kept exceptionally pure from Jewish admixture—until the policy of annexation was first fairly inaugurated, when Russia ravenously swallowed, along with the luscious morsels that belonged to her neighbours, the trichines that found such a congenial soil in her body politic and are now bidding fair to bring about a collapse of the entire system. The struggles of Russia now to throw off, now to assimilate and neutralise this dangerous element, are instructive if not edifying.

Little Russia was the first territory annexed, and with it were taken over the Jews who for generations had been wont to look upon that country as their fatherland. But if the Little Russians, who had been induced to unite by tempting promises, were treated with scant ceremony, the Jews could scarcely complain of receiving still less, and in 1727 the High Privy Council promulgated an order signed by the Empress Catherine I., to expel the "scurvy Jews,[†] male and female, who are living in Ukraine (Little Russia) and in Russian cities generally, and never again to allow them under any pretext to re-enter the country, and to take due care that in future the land be vigilantly guarded and kept free from them." But as the frontier, even in those days, was extensive, its guardians venal, and the Jews persevering and ingenious, many of the latter succeeded in maintaining their foothold without sacrificing their religion. Peter II., the gentleness of whose character reflected itself in the irresolution of his policy, relaxed the severity of this law to the extent of allowing Jews to visit South Russia for the purpose of attending the fairs there; a privilege which he thoughtfully saddled with the condition "that they should not take out of the country gold or silver money, nor even copper coins." "As to living in Little Russia," this curious ukase concludes, "it is strictly forbidden, nor shall any one dare to harbour scurvy Jews; in all these respects it is decreed that the ukase of the year 1727 shall remain in force." *

---

[*] It is only fair to say that the *Daily Telegraph* published a few serious papers on Russian Jews at the time, denying the promulgation of new laws, and giving a fairly complete and very candid statement of the whole question.

[*] Cf. Complete Code of Laws, No. 662, year 1676. In a treaty concluded with Poland in 1678 it was expressly stipulated that "the merchants and tradesmen of both sides will be free to travel without hindrance into each other's country 'except the Jews.'"—*Ibid.*, No. F30.

[†] There is no adjective in the original, but the word for Jews is an approbrious one implying still more than is expressed by the epithet I have added. The same word is still employed by such conservative organs of the Russian press as the semi-official *Novoye Vremya* and *Grashdanin.*

The Empress Anna, in the beginning of her reign, gave permission to Jews to visit Russia for purposes of commerce, but shortly before her death, repenting of that and other sins, reverted to the old policy of exclusion, which, however, was again for a time suspended during the Russo-Turkish war. In 1742, the Empress Elizabeth framed still more stringent laws against the Jews than any of her predecessors, and piously appealed to heaven for her warrant. "Except irremediable harm to our faithful subjects nothing can ever come of the presence in the land of such inveterate haters of the name of Christ the Saviour." †

Catherine II., whose policy was as little guided by her philosophy as were the metaphysics of many venturesome old schoolmen by their religious faith, began by following in the steps of her predecessors, and in the manifesto she issued during the earlier part of her reign inviting foreigners to come and settle in Russia, in consideration of special privileges offered them, Jews were expressly mentioned as disqualified. But the annexation of certain Polish governments, inhabited by large numbers of Jews, which she soon afterwards effected, compelled her to modify a policy that was based upon changing interest rather than fixed principle; and in the year 1769 she permitted the Jews to make Russia their home, on condition that they settled exclusively in the south, in the government of New Russia. This decree ‡ was the foundation-stone of the famous *Pale of Settlement,* which remains to the present day the main grievance of the Jews—the fruitful source of all their sufferings. All followers of the Mosaic law who inhabited the Polish provinces at the time of their annexation were allowed to remain where they were, and to enjoy the same rights as Russians; but it was not open to them to circulate in Russia proper, and towards the close of the Empress's reign they were condemned to pay double taxes. §

But all these attempts of Russia to kick against the pricks proved ineffectual. The Jews obeyed the laws of nature rather than those of shortsighted men, with results that alarmed the statesmen who were responsible for having made the two incompatible. An Imperial Commission was then created (1802), by the Emperor Alexander surnamed the Blessed, to study the question, and two years later a law was passed which appears to have been an honest endeavour to carry out two opposite lines of policy, on the principle of doing incompatible things by halves. One half of the measures are intended to protect the Christians against the heartless exploitation of the Jews, who are thus treated as born enemies of their Orthodox fellow subjects, while the other half is meant to bring about the brotherly union and ultimate amalgamation of the two avowedly hostile races. Very sordid motives were put before them to induce them to become Christians, care being meanwhile taken to keep them well within their Pale of Settlement, which was considerably narrowed, no Jew being allowed to live within fifty versts of the frontiers. It was obviously legislation of the half-hearted kind—an attempt (to use a popular Russian expression) to give the wolves a feed and keep the sheep whole, and like all such efforts it deservedly failed.

The Emperor Nicholas began his reign by issuing various ukases in the same spirit—forbidding the Jews to circulate in Russia, narrowing the Pale still more by excluding from it the cities of Kieff, Nicolaïeff, Sebastopol, and even certain of the streets of Vilna, and generally carrying out a policy of mild repression. On its becoming obvious in 1835 that most of these measures were but mere waste paper, the whole structure of previous legislation was pulled down and a bill passed "to enable Jews to live comfortably as tillers of the soil or artisans, and to keep them from idleness and illegal occupations." They are permitted by this law to attend fairs in the great centres of Russia—Nischny Novgorod, Irbitsk, Kharkoff, &c.—and special privileges are promised to those who turn their attention to the cultivation of the soil, an occupation which had proved so fatal to Russian Christians. The legislator was evidently desirous on the one hand of removing all distinctions between Jews and Christians, and on the other of localising the religion of the former as he would an infectious disease. Evidence of the former disposition is to be found in the clauses which throw open schools, gymnasies, universities, and other educational establishments to the members of the proscribed faith, and proof of the latter in the express declaration that in country districts the Jews were, as theretofore, to remain aloof from their Christian fellow-subjects, their communes to be separated from those of Orthodox Christians; and even in the cities the same barriers and distinctions to be rigorously maintained. Worse than all, as soon as it became evident that the proscribed people thoroughly appreciated the offer of education, by sending their children to Christian schools, where they became the most successful pupils and students, the Emperor issued another ukase (in 1844) to the Minister of Public Instruction, declaring it necessary to open Jewish schools for Jewish children, and ordering him to appoint a commission of rabbis to draft a scheme and to see that a special tax be levied on the Jews for the support of these denominational establishments.

---

* Complete Code of Laws, No. 5324.

† *Ibid.*, No. 8673. ‡ *Ibid.*, No. 13383. § *Ibid.*, No. 17224.

The late Czar Alexander II. was desirous of contributing as far as was possible, by means of legislation, to the assimilation of the Jewish element by the Christian population, but before taking any steps towards the accomplishment of this desire, he ordered the Minister of the Interior to have detailed reports drawn up by the governors and governors-general of the districts inhabited by Jews concerning the working of the laws already in force and the defects remarked in their conception or administration. The Governors of the provinces of Vitebak, Mohileff, and Minsk gave it as their opinion that the Jews of their districts were suffering incalculable harm from the action of the law depriving them of the rights of ordinary Russian subjects without relieving them of any of the corresponding obligations. Moreover, the towns, they added, in which Jews were authorised to live were so congested that they could get but little work to do; and "when they do receive orders for work, they are compelled to have recourse to fraud. This explains why they so often become noxious members of society, instead of conferring upon the community and upon themselves those benefits which, under more favourable conditions, one would naturally expect from them." The Governor of Poltava informed the Minister that the Jews of the south of Russia differed to a very considerable extent in language, dress, and mode of life from their co-religionists in other parts of the empire, and that the difference was entirely to their advantage. As a result of this, "they have almost wholly assimilated themselves with the native population; wherefore I would respectfully suggest that all the restrictions now in force against them be forthwith abolished." The remaining governors were of the same opinion, and the Minister of the Interior came to the conclusion that the accumulation of skilled Jewish artisans and workmen in the cities of the Pale of Settlement, and the competition resulting between themselves on the one hand and between them and the Christians on the other, "have an exceedingly injurious effect on both sides."

Nothing could be more candid than this avowal, nothing more well meaning than the intentions it called into being; but between intentions and their realisation lies an abyss—at times an impassable one. "Before the sun rises," says a Little Russian proverb, "the dew may eat one's eyes out." Half-hearted measures of relief were gradually doled out, certain restrictions abolished wholly or in part, and the administration of the existing laws became less severe, a difference which was, in itself, as long as it lasted, almost as welcome as a repeal of the exclusive legislation complained of. For men, not measures, really rule or ruin the nation; no other country possessing such a ponderous, voluminous collection of laws as the Empire of the Tsars, no other people so utterly lacking the conception of law, as of established rules to be respected and obeyed; and what can be more demoralising to a nation than the possession of laws, the transgression of which is the rule, the observance the rare exception?

Had the Emperor Alexander II. lived a year or two longer, it is highly probable that there would now no longer be a Jewish question in Russia; for the emancipation of that people was one of the points of the constitution which he had consented to grant. His son and successor is credited with a strong personal dislike to all followers of the Mosaic law, and is resolved, men say, to grind them down to the intellectual (they are already far below the economic) level of his Orthodox subjects. As this would be a heinous crime, it may possibly be a foul-mouthed calumny; but it is not a dispassionate survey of the main acts of his reign that would bring one to doubt the truth of the assertion. The chief measure now in force against the Jews is—and has been since the days of Catherine II.—the prohibition to leave the Pale of Settlement. No doubt this district is immense in extent, comprising the governments of Vilna, Volhynia, Grodno, Kovno, Minsk, Podolsk, Yekaterinoslav, Poltava, Tshernigoff and, under certain restrictions, portions of Kieff, Vitebsk, and Mohileff.* But for the Jews, who are not tillers of the soil, who are compelled to belong to merchant guilds or trade corporations that exist only in cities and towns, and are debarred from engaging in many pursuits open to Christians, the immensity of this territory shrinks to an incredible extent. And lest the Pale, even thus narrowly circumscribed, should seem too vast a hunting-ground for the "scurvy Jew," his Majesty enacted, two years ago, that "until further orders," no Jew will be permitted to leave the villages or hamlets in which they were living up to the 15th May, 1882. And as during those six years hundreds, nay thousands, of families changed their place of residence to other villages and towns, the execution of this law has reduced a large number of Jews to misery and ruin ; for not only do those suffer who are compelled to leave villages where they have their houses and their capital, but the community to which they are compelled to return, and in which competition has already reduced wages to the starvation line. So that the arena is in reality very circumscribed in which Jew meets Jew in the bitter struggle for life, and defeating his adversary inflicts incurable wounds upon himself.

---

* Cf. Law concerning Passports and Runaways, vol. xiv., division i., chap. i., art. 16.

There are one or two narrow and winding paths that lead out of this human penfold, but those who take them have often cause bitterly to regret their enterprise or unrest. Jews who have traded for not less than five years as members of the first merchant guild * within the Pale have the right to apply for admission to the same guild outside of it. But the exercise of this right bristles with difficulties. Thus, to say nothing of the petitions which he must send to the guilds, the police, the governors, and others, the merchant's first real embarrassment is caused by the law which prohibits him from hiring Christian servants, coupled with the circumstance that he has no hope of finding any in Russia proper, where Jews are few and belong exclusively to the privileged classes from which the ranks of domestic servants are never recruited. The law † which obtained under former Emperors allowed the merchant in this case to petition the Prefect of the Police of St. Petersburg or the Governor-General of Moscow—if his destination were either of these cities—for permission to take with him from the Pale a certain number of clerks and domestic servants, setting forth in the petition the reasons that determined him to fix the particular number asked for. It then depended on the decision of these dignitaries how many might accompany him, and from their decision there was no appeal. If he chose some other city for his abode, he was allowed but one clerk and four domestic servants, all of whom must be of irreproachable character and free, not only from the accusation, but even from the suspicion of crime. It is as easy to imagine the innumerable and serious embarrassments that this law is calculated to raise up in the every-day life of the Jewish merchant—the loss of time, of money, of health—as it is difficult to divine the good purpose which the legislator had in view in framing it. That law is still in force ; but, apprehensive that the permission it accords is far too extensive, his present Majesty's advisers have decreed that in case the merchant should dismiss or otherwise lose his servants, it shall not be open to him to send to the Pale for others to replace them, but he must shift as best he can.* Moreover, if from any cause whatever he cease to belong to the first guild before the lapse of ten years, he forfeits his right to reside in Russia and must return to the Pale. The circumstance that he availed himself during his stay of his legal right to purchase house property or land in Russia proper, is not deemed sufficiently grave to cause an exception to be made in his favour. Landlord or householder, it matters not, the law compels him to leave everything and return to the Pale, and logic and humanity are utterly powerless to help him.†

In Russia every Jew is compelled to belong to one of the established classes into which the tax-paying community is divided, and unless he have been received into one of the learned professions, he must be at all times ready to prove by documents, that require to be renewed every year, that he is a skilled artisan, a merchant of one of the two guilds, a petty trader, or an agriculturist. This means, besides endless worry and frequent insults from secretaries and petty puffed-up officials, the payment of considerable annual fees and—what is sometimes more irksome and oppressive—permanent residence in the city or town in which his guild or corporation has its headquarters.‡ If sheer want and the evident hopelessness of relieving it in a given town compel a Jew to disregard this law and wander about from place to place, as many have done and still are forced to do, he is arrested and treated or maltreated as that most miserable of human wretches, a Russian *brodyag*.[*]

---

* In Russia there are two merchant guilds (there were three till a few years ago) : the members of the first pay much higher fees than those of the second, and both pay larger fees and taxes than the petty traders. One must be a man of considerable means to belong to the first merchant guild in St. Petersburg or Moscow. In the latter city there are but four hundred members of the first guild all told, many of whom are foreigners.

† Vol. xiv., div. i., chap. i., art. 16.

* Decision of Minister of Interior and Minister of Finances, given on 17-29 April, 1885.

† Cf. Complete Collection of Laws, No. 41779 and 48175.

‡ Complete Collection of Laws, vol. xiv., div. i., chap. i., arts. 1 and 2.

But, independently of those general taxes paid by Jews for the support of institutions from the benefits of which they are in most cases expressly excluded, they are also subjected to a special system of taxation, from which Christians are exempt, and which, though destined in theory for the special needs of the Jewish community, are nevertheless employed in part to replenish the imperial coffers.[†] Thus the so-called "Box-tax" [‡] is one of the most comprehensive tributes ever levied upon a community, its oppressiveness being intensified by the odious method practised of farming it out to greedy speculators. For every animal, fowl, and bird killed for food according to Jewish rites (Kosher) a fixed sum has to be paid. And on every pound of that same meat, and on every one of those identical fowls, an additional sum is levied when they are sold. Jews who have taken their degrees in universities, or have succeeded in gaining admission to a learned profession, may, on satisfying their butcher that they are doctors or masters, purchase a certain quantity of animal food free of this duty: viz., two pounds and a half of meat a day, if the privileged person is single, and four pounds and a half if married; he may also, if a bachelor, purchase on the same advantageous conditions one fowl or bird daily, and two if he be a family man.[§] In addition to this there is a candle tax, the proceeds of which are employed to support those denominational schools with which the Jews would most gladly dispense, if they were allowed to avail themselves of the ordinary educational establishments, to which they have quite as much right as their Christian fellow subjects. Over and above these oppressive tributes, all Jews have to pay a certain percentage—from which Christians are, of course, exempt—on the rent they receive for their houses, shops, stores, granaries; on the gross income they receive from the sale of wine in public-houses and inns; they are likewise subject to a special annual tax on distilleries and breweries, glass works, copper and iron works, tar, pitch, and tallow works, and for the permission to set up as cattle-breeders. In addition to this, all money left by deceased Jews pays a fixed percentage to the same common fund; and finally a fine is paid for the authorisation to wear Hebrew apparel. "All Jews who desire to wear a skull cap" (I am quoting textually from the Statute book), "are hereby subjected to a permanent tax of neither more nor less (*sic!*) than five silver roubles a year each."[*] This is not an extract from obsolete laws framed during the Middle Ages, but a clause of a law drawn up in the last quarter of the sober nineteenth century, and strictly enforced to-day. That the legislator was in grim earnest about the matter is evident from the following provision concerning the wearing of other articles of Jewish dress: "In fixing the amount of taxes to be levied for the right of wearing Hebrew dress, male and female, the governor of the district is hereby enjoined to take heed that it be considerably augmented in comparison with the other objects subject to the Box-Tax."[†]

It is difficult to convey anything like an adequate idea of the vexation, disputes, and bad blood caused by the spirit in which this law is administered. But it is scarcely needful to descant upon the spirit, when the letter itself contains so much to bear out the charge of deliberate injustice which has been frequently advanced against it. Take, for instance, the provision made for the not uncommon case in which the animal or fowl is slaughtered in one place and sold in another. "Whereas the Box-Tax is levied according to weight on the sale of the objects liable to it, be it ordained that if a Jew, having slaughtered an animal within the boundaries of one tax farm, desire to carry it to another for the purpose of selling it, he is liable to pay the tax in the first tax-farming district for the slaughter alone; but the tax farmer of the second district possesses the right to exact payment both of the tax for slaughter and also of the tax for sale." [‡] This is but a sample. The voluminousness and minuteousness—to say nothing of the vexatiousness—of the laws against the Jewish millions who have appreciably contributed economically and intellectually to the prosperity of the Empire, would drive any one but a Talmudist or a Benedictine to despair.

But besides merchants of the first guild, university graduates of the highest standard, and doctors and masters, are also privileged to pass beyond the Pale of Settlement.

---

[*] This terrible word *brodyag* does not convey much to the ordinary English reader. Those who are curious to know something of the indescribable tortures inflicted on this army of unpitied wretches will find some facts relating to the subject in *The Fortnightly Review*, July, 1890, in the article on "Russian Prisons." Cf. Complete Collection of Laws, vol. ix., art. 953.

[†] Complete Collection of Laws, vol. v., art. 281; Supplement, chap. i., art. 1.

[‡] So called because the proceeds were kept in a box employed solely for this purpose.

[§] Supplement to article 281 of fifth vol. of Laws.

[*] Complete Collection of Laws, vol. v., art. 10, observ. 4.

[†] Supplement, chap. iii., art. 14.

[‡] *Ibid.*, Supplement, art. 45.

Skilled artisans can likewise seek admission to the corporations, or "Tsekhs," of their respective calling in any part of the empire. This clause enfranchises, to all appearance, a numerous class of men, which might perhaps be made to include the best portion of the Hebrew people. These appearances, which would probably be trustworthy enough if observed in any other part of Europe, are rightly deceptive in Russia, and Englishmen who come in contact with the wan, worn, wizen-faced Russian Jews—like so many Lazaruses risen too late from the dead to live longer than a few short hours—who played such a tragic part in the sweating scandals that came to light in London some time ago, will readily understand that the children of creatures of this stamp—and the majority of Russian Jews are such—have as much chance of becoming astronomers as of qualifying for what the law in Russia understands by "skilled artisans." It is less difficult, however, for the daughters of the classes who possess a fairly sufficient income to become midwives—a profession which also confers upon those who practise it the right of passing beyond the Pale.* But his present Majesty's Government, noticing that many young Jewesses succeeded in passing the examinations required for the certificate of midwife, instead of withdrawing the privilege accorded by law to this profession, as would be natural under the circumstances, acted somewhat like the scrupulous Quaker of apocryphal celebrity who, when the pirate caught hold of one of the ship's ropes in order to board the vessel, exclaimed: "Thou wantest this rope, friend?" (and speedily cutting it) "take it; may it stand thee in good stead"; they confirmed the privilege, but explained that from December, 1885, it would not extend from midwives to the children of such Jewesses, who would be compelled to live in the Pale.† Another instructive instance of the way in which laws favourable to the Jews can be made oppressive without being formally abolished occurred two years ago in Kieff. A certain M. Goldenberg, who had obtained his degree at the University, and is therefore qualified to live in Russia proper, own houses, and land, &c., resolved to hand over to his wife a house that belonged to him in the Sophia Street. The deed of transfer was duly drawn up, but the authorities refused to register it. M. Goldenberg appealed to the law courts, relying upon the express terms of the law (Art. 100, vol. x., parts 1 and 5), which enacts that the husband communicates all his civil rights and privileges to his wife. But the law courts decided that every statute concerning the Jews must be interpreted in a restrictive sense, and consequently they upheld the refusal of the authorities to validate the act of transfer, dismissing the suit with costs, on the ground that, though M. Goldenberg himself possesses civil rights, he does not communicate them to his wife.

The most arduous way of obtaining the right of free circulation throughout the empire would naturally seem that which leads through the universities, or one of the higher educational establishments, for the children of men who can never tell in the morning whether they and their families may not have to go to bed supperless at night. And yet so painfully vivid was the consciousness of the horrors from which they would thus escape, so powerful the aversion to go back to vegetate and rot in the hateful Pale, that hundreds of young men entered the universities, valorously battled for years with want, sickness, and discouragement, many of them like Heyne, the German classical scholar who first raised philology to the dignity of a science, often exchanging their dinner for tallow-candles, which burned during whole nights in their garrets and cellars, lighting them on to knowledge and to fame. And the Government, seeing that knowledge is power, and that it is not good that power should be placed in the hand of "vile Jews," resolved to close up this issue out of misery, ignorance, and the Pale. When the present Czar succeeded to the throne the educational law, in so far as it affected the right of Jews to have their children taught in the ordinary schools of the empire, was formulated as follows: "Jewish children may be admitted into and educated in the State educational establishments, private schools, and boarding schools of the districts in which they reside, no difference whatever being made between them and other children."* This law was in force down to the 19th June, 1885, when his Majesty ordered the admission of Jews to the Technological Institute† of Kharkoff to be limited to 10 per cent. of the total number of students. Nine months later his Majesty was "graciously pleased," says the official document, "to forbid absolutely the admission of any Jew to the Veterinary Institute of Kharkoff." On the 17th December,

---

* Coll. of Laws, vol. xiv., sect. i., chap. lii.

† Decision of the Department of the Police on the 30th December, 1885.

* Coll. of Laws, vol. ix., book i., chap. iv., art. 966.

† There are but two Technological Institutes in all Russia.

1886, the present Minister of Public Instruction—an Armenian by birth—promulgated a law the preamble of which declared that whereas very many young Jews, eager to partake of the benefits of higher classical, technical, and professional education, were annually presenting themselves for admission to the universities, &c., passing the examinations and prosecuting their studies in the various establishments of the empire, it was found desirable to put a stop to such an unsatisfactory state of things, to which end it was enacted that in future the number of Jewish students in Russian universities should not exceed 10 per cent. of the entire number of students in the universities within the Pale, 5 per cent. in other provincial universities, and 3 per cent. in those of Moscow and St. Petersburg; and on the 8th July, 1887, the same measure was applied to all gymnasies or grammar schools without exception.

The immediate results of this curious legislation were painful in the extreme; thousands of young men who, by dint of years of hard, steady work and stoic self-denial on their part and on the part of their parents, had at last come within sight of the promised land, were rudely awakened from their day-dreams and jeeringly told to return to their "vile" people to live and die, pariahs among helots. I shall never forget the harrowing scenes I witnessed, the tears, the entreaties, the wailing and despair immediately after the passing of that drastic law: parents begging their Christian friends—ay, and entreating their Christian enemies—to intercede with the minister to except their only child from the operation of the Act; young boys putting on the ill-fitting masks of dissimulation and endeavouring by flattery administered to the sons of high officials—their own schoolfellows—to obtain permission to finish the studies already brilliantly begun or well-nigh ended; orthodox priests, grave Russian officials, and even well-known statesmen gibing and jeering at the checkmated Jew. One of the bitterest and possibly best deserved reproaches which Christian writers administer to Julian the Emperor was the insidiousness of his persecution of the Christians, as manifested in the order he issued prohibiting them from attending lectures in the schools. Julian couched that order in language as elegant and brilliant as that of Lucian, and defended it with arguments worthy of Aristotle—invulnerable to anything more logical than an appeal to a highly-developed sentiment of humanity. The legislators of Holy Russia succeeded in closely copying Julian's insidiousness without imitating his wit or appreciating his logic. My readers do not, I feel confident, need to be told whether the grave legislators of a vast empire engaged in the practical solution of a most delicate question—fate of millions of their subjects—are justified in giving to laws adverse to these millions the odious form of a sneer at their religious tenets. It had been usual in Russia at all times to profess and occasionally to practise respect for the Jewish observance of the Sabbath. Jewish boys were not compelled to attend school on Saturdays, nor witnesses—if they objected—to take an oath in courts of justice on that day. But since the present Czar ascended the throne all that has been changed. Thus, among the laws concerning the education of Jews we read: "The learned Committee of the Ministry of Public Instruction, having deliberated upon the question whether Jewish pupils of grammar schools should be excused from written examinations on Saturdays, ... decided that once they enter public educational establishments Jews are bound to submit to the rules thereof, and the *very act of entrance into these schools is of itself a proof that they and their parents have outgrown that exclusiveness which stickles for the strict observance of the Sabbath.*"* This jest is the deliberate work of the most learned body of men in the most enlightened department of the Government of Russia—work for which they are paid out of the hard-earned wages of the Jew, at whose religious convictions and moral courage they thus poke fun!

The circumstance that Jewish children seek for education in schools founded for children belonging to all religious persuasions being thus authoritatively construed as a proof that they and their parents laugh in their sleeves at one of the fundamental tenets of their faith, the only course open to parents who objected to the practical consequences of this interpretation was to found schools of their own—a costly solution, it is true, but the only feasible one. Several communities unhesitatingly adopted it and set about availing themselves of the law which conferred this right upon them.† But the Government, informed of their intention, forthwith repealed that law, and declared by a decree of the Minister of Public Instruction that it was no longer advisable to authorise the opening of such schools, inasmuch as the ordinary educational establishments that exist for children of all religious persuasions outside the Pale would also satisfactorily meet the requirements of the Jews.* The logical outcome of these two legislative acts is therefore that, on the one hand, Jewish parents desirous of having their children instructed must send them to Christian schools, if there happen to be a vacancy there; and on the other hand, their doing so is regarded by the Government as a sort of mild apostasy, in consequence of which they will be no longer treated as strictly orthodox Jews.

---

* Circular of the Ministry of Public Instruction. No. 15038.

† Collection of Laws, vol. ix., sect. i., art. 969, and observations.

Thus foiled and checkmated on every side, small wonder that some of the most ambitious or least steadfast among them brought themselves to purchase such instruction as grammar schools could give them by the formal rejection of all the specially Talmudic doctrines, and the adoption of the faith of the sect of Karaim, who in Russia enjoy privileges that are denied the Talmudists. Thus a number of young men in the Crimea, after much inner struggling and hesitation, resolved to stifle their scruples and take this doubtful course; but they had first to petition the Minister of the Interior (an Atheist, as it chanced) for permission to take the fateful step. They were soon made aware, however, that they were asking for the moon; the heavens and the earth may pass away, but no Russian Jew can ever abjure his faith in order to become a member of the Karaim sect—for a law of Catherine II. forbids it. There was now only one other way to obtain the coveted boon, namely by stealth, and this case has also been thoughtfully provided for by the wise legislator, who decreed that those Jewish parents who, on sending their children to school, neglect to make declaration that they are Jews, will be subjected to exactly the same punishment as if they were convicted of—forgery.† This sounds somewhat harsh to Englishmen; it may also seem strange to logicians and legislators of every nation; but the Jews feel that they have reason to be thankful for the leniency that refrained in such cases from treating them as incendiaries or regicides.

The Hebrew people in Russia are characterised by an insatiable thirst for such education as can be had in that country; it would seem to partake of the nature of a passion that grows with their growth, gaining strength from the very opposition it encounters.‡ The Government, on the other hand, is firmly resolved to starve it out and to thrust the Jews back to ignorance, blind obedience, and the Pale. And this is perfectly natural; if it seems immoral, it is only to those English Russophiles with whom fanaticism is the sole substitute for knowledge, and who damage the cause they would further by judging such acts by a European standard of morality—a mistake which no Russian statesman will ever commit. The reasons that make a dispassionate observer look upon the present persecution of five or six million Jews as natural are not far to seek: they are all comprised in the one principle of self-preservation applied by a people which is standing on a much lower moral and intellectual level than the bulk of Europeans.

An autocracy may at times be quite as good and wise a government as a republic or a constitutional monarchy, and no honest student of history, whatever political opinions he may profess, can withhold his admiration from men like Oliver Cromwell, or even Dr. Francia. But the autocracy of Russia, in which tens of thousands of irresponsible tsarlets devour, like human locusts, all the material and moral resources of the people, is a foul stain on modern Europe, which only crime can perpetuate and human blood wash away. The logical correlative of such rulers is an ignorant, broken-spirited, shiftless people; and the rulers are resolved to keep the bulk of Russians ignorant, broken-spirited, and shiftless, on the principle that he who wishes for eggs must put up with the cackling of hens—*qui vult finem vult media.* This is the key to that series of oppressive laws enacted during the past five years, the undisguised object of which is to deprive the masses not only of what is usually termed education, but of all kind of instruction whatever. The results obtained up to the present moment are magnificent or disastrous, according to the angle of vision from which we view them; the bulk of the Russian people are disgustingly servile, incredibly superstitious, hopelessly shiftless and improvident, the natural prey of every passing quack or impostor, and the power of the Tsar is proportionately strengthened.* The semi-official journal of the capital describes the Russians as "a people run wild, savage, supine. The judges and crown lawyers of the empire," it adds, "can testify that *the number of words in use among the Russian peasantry does not exceed from one to two hundred. Even the Kirgheez nomads,* with their wonderful memory, foresight, imagination, and shiftiness, *stand on a far higher level than our Russian peasantry.*"* Over against these "country louts" stand the Jews with wits sharpened by necessity and appetites whetted by gnawing hunger—"like ravenous wolves beside appetising sheep," as an official organ once described them. And the Russian Government is engaged in solving the problem how to keep them together in a state of semi-starvation without a catastrophe. Blinding the wolves is the latest solution that seems to have suggested itself, and, on the principle of self-preservation, why, it may be asked, should Russian statesmen not give it a trial?

---

* Ministerial Circular, No. 7, of the year 1888.

† Collection of Laws, vol. ix., art. 968.

‡ According to the statistics collected by the Ministry of Public Instruction before the introduction of the measures forbidding Jews to educate their children (1885-6), the percentage of Russian children in the higher educational establishments of the empire was twenty-two in ten thousand, whereas the percentage of Jewish children amounted to forty-eight in ten thousand.

* To give a case in point, the *Novoye Vremya*, describing how the Jews of the district of Starokonstantinovsk return to hamlets and villages in which they are forbidden to reside, almost as fast as they are driven out, adds: "The Russian peasantry, instead of assisting the police to expel them, do just the reverse—harbour and screen them from justice, and when interrogated deny that the Jews in question live there, and assert that they have only come on a visit. *A Jew has only to buy a glass of vodka and promise a trifle besides, and for this Russian peasants will, almost without exception, lie*

Naturally, much more is hereby implied than deprivation of mere lay instruction. The Talmudic religion, whatever else may be said about it, is in itself a course of mental training capable of rendering the mental powers as supple and sharp as would a course of mathematics or of German metaphysics. And as long as a Jew is allowed to remain a Jew he will continue to be infinitely better equipped for the battle of life than the best of his Russian competitors. Hence the natural desire of the more far-seeing among Russian politicians to extirpate Judaism, root and branch; hence the feverish efforts now being made to realise that scheme by employing every known form of injustice and violence that stops short of death.

Every sordid motive that a legislator well versed in this lower branch of his profession could suggest is put before the Jew to induce him to abandon the faith of his forefathers, without replacing it by anything better. Privileges denied his brethren, money and its various equivalents, even the hope of unlawful plunder, have been deliberately relied upon by these champions of Christianity to tempt the Hebrew to please his Emperor by denying his God. Imagine one of those lean, cadaverous caricatures of humanity who crowd the cities of the Pale, and whose existence under the actual circumstances is a stronger argument against Russian Christianity than any that could be drawn from the writings of Strauss or Huxley; and suppose that accident or design puts it in his power to defraud a wealthy co-religionist, by abuse of confidence, fraud, or downright robbery. He succumbs to the temptation, beggars his brother, and immediately becomes a member of the Orthodox Church, as a sort of corollary. His victim prosecutes him and summons a cloud of credible, respectable witnesses who can prove the charge to the satisfaction of the most sceptical. He, on his side, suborns two or three abandoned Christian wretches, whose life is one coarse libel on Christianity. The case comes on for trial, and the Russian courts, guided by Article 330 of the Tenth Volume of Laws, will refuse to allow the Jewish witnesses to depose against the defendant, because they are naturally supposed to bear a grudge against an apostate; and the light-hearted perjury of the Orthodox Christians (which costs, as we have seen, but a small measure of *vodka*) sets the seal of legality on crimes that would send their author into penal servitude in England. Of course, there is one way out of the difficulty: the plaintiff may go to work and bribe his witnesses to commit perjury too, *i.e.*, to embrace Christianity, which they hate, and then their testimony will be received with credence and respect. For when a Jew finds the truth, supposing that truth to be the "orthodox" faith, he is caressed and made much of for the time being; the law requires "that he be baptised only in a city church, and on a Sunday or festival, and with all possible pomp and ceremony."* If he be married he

---

when questioned in a court of justice—ay, lie in the most effronting way conceivable, even though, as is often the case, they are giving evidence upon oath."—*Novoye Vremya*, 4th April, 1890. None of the conflicting conclusions which can be drawn from this unanswerable and lamentable fact are of good omen for the speedy settlement of the Jewish question in Russia.

* *Grashdanin*, 19th January, 1890. Cf. also *Novosti*, 20th January, 1890. An English Russophile organ which might possibly render some services to its Tsar by courageous honesty which it can never effect by mere coarse flattery, *à tort et a travers*, recently alluding to a former paper of this series, the statements of which it completely garbles, seriously puts forward the following argument: If the Russian people are such ignorant, shiftless loons as they are represented to be, they are sorely in need of an autocratic government that will protect them against their own instincts; if they are enlightened, moral, well-behaved, autocracy is likewise the best government for them, for they would otherwise have long ago cried out against its existence. "If the books are in accordance with the teachings of the Koran," said the fanatic Caliph, of the Alexandrian library, "they are needless, and must be burned: If opposed to the Koran, they are heretical, and must be destroyed forthwith." The accusation brought against the Russian Government, and demonstrated by unanswerable facts, is that they are *deliberately demoralizing* the wretched people in order to perpetuate the chaotic misrule on which they are thriving. What would any honest, unprejudiced Englishman say to the following candid avowal of the Government's programme, made by the aristocratic organ subsidized by the Government: "The Russian peasant possesses *great powers of endurance and remarkable patience. And these, in sum, are the qualities of the Russian which should form the basis of the relations of persons in authority to the peasants*; and it must be admitted that the authorities have to deal with a soil very favourable if it is *only ploughed and harrowed intelligently.*"—*Grashdanin*, 2nd January, 1890. If this be not Macchiavellism, its defence in an English periodical is disinterested love of the good, the beautiful, and the true.

* Supplement to article 76 (section 5).

must either divorce his wife or compel her too to subordinate her religious convictions to her conjugal affection ; and if she refuses to become a Christian, neither herself *nor* her Christian husband will be permitted to leave the Pale.[*] Finally, in order to contribute to the sacredness of the family, which, Russians complain, is lacking among the Jews, the new laws give a Jewish boy or girl the right and the encouragement to abandon the faith of his fathers without consulting his parents.[†] The difficulties thrown in the way of opening synagogues and prayer-houses are as numerous and as prohibitive as those which have been so effectually opposed to opening of schools, and the Rabbis of those that already exist are harassed and persecuted till they resign or go over to the enemy. In one place the ministry refuses to confirm the election of a respected Rabbi, conducted in strict accordance with all the laws and regulations, simply because, penetrated with a deep sense of his moral responsibility, he refuses to prostitute a religious office to the desires of political Chauvinists, and they unceremoniously put in his place an upstart who was not disliked only by those who did not know him. The Jews of Yekaterinburg, who had lived there for generations, summoned up courage once to ask permission to have, not a synagogue, but merely a house of prayer.[‡] The Government, in reply, very quickly discovered a long-forgotten ukase, which absolutely forbids Jews to reside in that city, or in any part of the Ural, and they are now about to be dragged thousands of miles to the Pale, which many of them have never seen before. In the village of Kakhovka the Hebrew community was lately summoned to appear before the new police superintendent, who at once informed them that he had orders to close up and seal their prayer-house, and to bring them up to trial for having four years ago opened one, "and for having frequently prayed therein," without being authorised to do so by the Government.

These are some of the measures which have driven thousands of Jews to apostatise ; and one reads very frequently in the Russian newspapers of "sixty young Jews who, desirous of entering the university, have abjured the Law of Moses" ; of forty others who became Christians because their business called them outside of the Pale, and scores of others who for equally valid reasons are introduced every month into the true fold, where they are as much in their place as eagles in a barnyard. Any one of the measures employed against the Jews would be enough to "convert" three-fourths of the Christians of Russia to Shamanism or Bouddism in a week ; and the circumstance that about six million persecuted and miserable wretches remain steadfastly faithful to a religion that causes their life to be changed into a fiery furnace without the angel to keep it cool, is the nearest approach to a grandiose miracle that has been vouchsafed to this unbelieving generation. The Orthodox Church cannot be congratulated on these wedding guests whom it is daily picking up in the highways and byways, and bidding, or rather driving, into the spiritual banqueting hall. Not only is one prepared for the discovery that they are not provided with the indispensable wedding garment, but one cannot affect surprise to learn that such raiment as they have is swarming with disease germs which will do dire execution on the assembled guests. I have conversed with numbers of "converted" Jews of all classes of society, and I can affirm that, with few exceptions, not only have they not the faintest glimmer of faith in Christianity, but they hate the very name, despise its priests, sneer at its ceremonies, and loathe themselves for perjuring their souls by receiving its sacraments and praising the name of its founder. And they bring up their sons and daughters in the same sentiments. I know a respectable family in Moscow, the father of which was "converted" like thousands of his co-religionists, and I can answer for it that not one of his sons or daughters had a shred of belief in God or devil, their religious faith being summed up in the one conviction that the Orthodox Church is deserving of the intense hatred of every honest man and woman, and that no opportunity should ever be missed of contributing to its ruin.

Some of these "converts" repent of what they have done, secretly do penance for their sin, and return to the synagogue. But their sighs and tears are as unavailing as those of their forefathers who, sitting down by the waters of Babylon, wept as they remembered Sion; no Rabbi would dare give them help or advice, much less admission to the community; he would forfeit his position if he did. One of these poor wretches, Fichtenstein by name, a venerable old man of sixty, was induced in a moment of weakness to "embrace Christianity," for which he afterwards did penance, literally in sackcloth and ashes. He visited the synagogue as often as he could, where his fervent, tearful prayers attracted the attention of the congregation. The authorities set a watch on his movements, acquired the conviction that he did really pray in the Jewish place of worship, and had him straightway arrested and sent for trial. The example of these men, it is complained, does not tend to raise the moral level of the Russian Church; "they scatter the seeds of infidelity and insubordination —religious, political, and social—broadcast throughout the country," say the astonished spiritual and civil authorities, "and the harm thus done is incalculable." Harm it may be; incalculable, however, it certainly is not. The Jews may all of them in time be brought to "embrace Russian Christianity," as the Moorish chieftain Almanzor embraced his Christian enemies; and in both cases the embrace is pestilential, deadly.

---

[*] Complete Coll. of Laws, vol. x., part i., art. 81.

[†] *Ibid.*, section 3.

[‡] The abject fear which the Jews have of displeasing the authorities exceeds belief. Take, for instance, a man in the position of Baron Ginsburg, of St. Petersburg, a millionaire and a baron of the Russian empire, who might well venture to undertake much that is forbidden to his poorer brethren ; and yet he is mortally afraid of saying, or doing, or leaving unsaid and undone anything that might possibly offend even a petty Russian official. He dares not speak even in favour of the Russian Government, lest that should seem an attempt on his part to patronize ; and he would as soon cut his tongue out as say a word against it. A few years ago he caused all the Russian laws concerning the Jews to be printed in one volume at his expense ; but when the work was done he reflected that his motives might be misinterpreted, so he withdrew it from circulation ; and no entreaties on the part of his own intimate friends could persuade him to give away one of the thousands of copies that were lying on the shelves of his library. In Odessa, where the governor is Judophobe and something more, a Jew will soon be afraid to sneeze in the street.

But the written laws against the Jews, severe as they undoubtedly are, can give no idea of the actual amount and kind of suffering inflicted on this unfortunate people by those who administer them, and from whose interpretation and conduct there lies no appeal. Not only must one take into consideration the kind of whip with which they are beaten, but likewise the arm that wields it; and in this case it is the sinewy, bloody arm that knouted so many Christians to death. For some officials the Jews exist as a fertile source of revenue—a godsend to be grateful for—the bribes they are compelled annually to pay exceeding by a large amount the total of their double annual taxes. This state of things reminds one of our own Henry III. pledging all the Jews of his kingdom to his brother for the loan of a considerable sum of money, authorising him in return to keep them in his power until they paid the debt to the last farthing. Russia's solution of the Jewish problem has not advanced beyond that stage yet. Here is what one of the most trustworthy and impartial newspapers of Russia has to say on the subject:—

> "The restrictions laid upon the Jews serve in reality as an unfailing and inexhaustible source of income to the authorities charged with their execution; all those Jews whose rights are more or less doubtful manage to get them changed into undoubted rights by the payment of uninterrupted blackmail; *battues* and domiciliary visits, which assume the most improbable forms, also wind up with a money tribute. Thus on a dark night, when profound silence reigns everywhere—usually a Friday night is chosen, when every Jew is at home—suddenly the Jewish quarter of the city is surrounded by a cordon, and a great multitude of people, men, women, and children, old men—nay, often even the sick—are arrested and packed off to the police station; here, for lack of room, they are kept all night in the courtyard in the open air, no matter how severe the cold may be, no matter how inclement the weather. These are facts." *

And facts, I may add, that are related not of last century, nor last year, but last winter.

This hunting of Jews who are living where they have no right to reside, whose passports have expired, who have transacted some business which their faith disqualifies them from transacting, or who are working hard to keep body and soul together in a position which they are not allowed to occupy, has now become an every-day occurrence, that no longer excites surprise and seldom even evokes compassion. The newspapers chronicle these things with as perfect indifference as a huxter's change of residence. "The authorities have ordered the assistant notaries who belong to the Hebrew persuasion to be immediately dismissed from their situations in Kovno," says the *Warsaw Courier*, and people read and pass on phlegmatically to the next item of intelligence. "M. Akimoff, the President of the Divisional Court," says another paper, "has informed all notaries that they must dismiss their clerks who are members of the Jewish communion, and fill up their places with Russians." † And people yawn and read on.

The suffering inflicted by this wholesale proscription of the Jews is intensified a hundred-fold by the wantonly savage manner in which it is carried out, the victims being treated in many cases exactly as if, instead of human beings, they were brute beasts, who might be chased without impropriety in the fields and highways, and tied up in an outhouse, when caught, till they could be conveniently whipped or physicked. The following incident will illustrate my meaning: A considerable number of Jews repair every year from various parts of Russia to the Liman in Odessa, to test the medicinal virtue of the waters, which are strongly recommended by Russian doctors in cases of rheumatism, gout, scrofula, skin diseases, paralysis, etc. Numerous petitions, stamped with revenue stamps, certificates, and documents of all kinds have to be drawn up, presented, and verified before a Jew can receive his double passport and permission to pass a few weeks at the waters of the Liman. And when he has passed through this wearisome and expensive ordeal and has begun the cure, he is not even then free from persecution. He or she may, at any time of the day or night, be pounced upon by the police, snatched up, ladies as well as men, and ignominiously subjected to a medical examination and pronounced impostors who are at the waters under false pretences, having none of the disorders which the latter are supposed to cure. No farther back than the month of July, the Jewish ladies and gentlemen who were using the waters of the Andreïeff Liman in Odessa, were thus unceremoniously arrested one day—night is usually the favorite time for arrests, domiciliary visits, &c., in Russia—and marched off to the city doctor, who was commanded to examine them thoroughly, and to find out whether they were really suffering from the diseases for which they were being treated, or had merely come for their pleasure! It is no easy matter even for a physician to decide in the twinkling of an eye, so to say, whether a man has or has not rheumatism, gout, tic, scrofula, &c., &c. The Odessa doctor, however, knew exactly what was required of him, and justified the confidence with which he was honoured: he declared that two-thirds of the entire number of Jews were in good health and had no need of the Liman waters. Even if this were demonstrably true, the services of these persons might be desirable or even indispensable to their invalid relatives, and on this ground their presence might have been tolerated; but the authorities sent them home at once.*

---

* *The Week* (Nedaylya), 7th September, 1890.

† *Odessa News*, October, 1886.

It is no light matter for the Jews, who, after all, are mere human beings, to make a stand against a powerful government which is mobilizing its numerous army of officials, employing all its pecuniary resources, and all the ingenuity of human hate to crush them out of existence. Still they cannot—on the whole—be accused of not doing their best to dispute every inch of ground, of not struggling for some few of the rights of men, when possible, on a strictly legal basis. No losing game—with stakes so high—was ever yet played with such unfaltering spirit. No fox hotly pursued by eager hounds and joyful huntsmen ever employed more profound cunning, more suppleness, more talent for adapting, on the spur of the moment, all the rapidly changing circumstances of time, place, and persons to the main end in view, than the Jews. The tragi-comic element that results from this pitting of intellect against brute force, the adventures, curious escapes, the plots and counterplots, would, if properly treated, make a most entertaining volume—but entertaining as were the jokes and puns and witty remarks made at the gladiator fights in Rome, and which drew their point from their contrast to the human being grimly fighting on the threshhold of eternity, to prolong for a few minutes the brutal pleasure of a jaded rabble.

The laws that regulate the military service of the Jews are characterised by their Draconian severity. Most of the alleviations and privileges accorded to Christians, and which tend so visibly to promote good feeling between the men and their superiors, are inexorably denied them, and the hardships inseparable from life in the barracks, with its long winter night-watches and exhausting summer manœuvres, are needlessly made unendurable to the soldier who keeps holy the Sabbath. A Jew can never become an officer as a Christian can—nay, as even a Mohammedan can, who is not disqualified from the highest position in the military hierarchy, filling offices of trust and responsibility. This is a remarkable—it seems an unjust—restriction; but the Jew, hardened by use and want, is prepared for it. But why go still further and allow every soldier who calls himself a Christian, a Mohammedan, or a Buddhist to lord it over him, and not only hector and bully, but assault him with absolute impunity, sometimes with direct approbation? The paralysing fear of encountering these untold miseries of soldier life, from which the only escape is suicide, accounts for the deep-rooted aversion which many Jews manifest to don the livery of the Czar, and the desperate attempts they make to escape from serving in the army. Hundreds of mothers secretly leave their native places before the birth of their children, which, when the children are boys, they refuse to register, thus placing their innocent offspring, almost from the moment of its birth, in a position bristling with still greater difficulties, with more terrible hardships than the one they so greatly dread.*

---

* *Novoye Vremya*, 23rd July, 1890.

* "My attention was drawn to the strange fact of the virtual cessation of male births among the Jews, as if by common accord all Jewish women had resolved to put an end to the

It is impossible for a Jew to do anything in a simple, straightforward manner. He could not even if he would; he sets to work to carry out the most commonplace and lawful business transaction just as if his negotiations were but a blind to mask some hidden design, the nature of which you have no means of guessing—it may be to rob you, it may be to murder you. All his dealings are fenced and hedged round with so many provisos and conditions and contingent obligations, that a very experienced lawyer would have no light task if he were set to unravel the web. The following is a very typical instance of the trouble taken by Jews to wrest to their own benefit one of the laws framed for their ruin. Intending to conclude a business arrangement, whatever its nature may be, the validity of which may hereafter be called in question by the other party to the contract, a Jew first makes a pretence of lending him some costly furniture or delivering valuable goods —which he himself never had to give or lend—and then sues him for the value. The case comes on for trial (the Russian law courts are literally clogged with such fictitious lawsuits, which prevent the hearing of really important actions); both parties are heard with all the conscious seriousness and dignified leisure which beseems a Russian judge. The defendant seems to make a determined stand, but loses his case and is condemned to pay the sum demanded. Now this is exactly the sum that would represent the plaintiff's loss, *if* at any future time the defendant should call in question the validity of the contract which they *have not yet concluded.* He would then claim a writ of execution to recover the sum adjudged him by the court.*

Formerly a Jew could lend money on landed securities. Now this is absolutely forbidden; so, before advancing the sum demanded, he requires the borrower to give him a note of hand for the capital and the interest combined, he next sues him for the amount, and when judgment is given in his favour, advances the sum of money required. Or, suppose a merchant or petty trader has business in some town or city which his quality of Jew precludes him from visiting. If he petitions the authorities to allow him to go there and spend a week or a fortnight, he is insulted for his pains. Instead of this, however, two of his friends or dependents quarrel and summon him to give evidence before the local magistrate, which he does; but one of the parties appeals to the higher court, which sits in the city he is so desirous of visiting, and he is again called upon to give evidence, this time on oath. This also he does, if it is a criminal prosecution, as it probably would be, at the cost of the crown. One of the litigants is perhaps condemned, but the prosecutor thereupon generously forgives him, and all parties are satisfied. The law courts of the west of Russia are positively brought to a standstill by the overwhelming number of fictitious actions of this kind entered by Jews, who thus compel the imperial judges to spend their time and labour and the resources of the State in assisting the Jewish community to evade the very laws which they are sworn to administer.* A more ludicrous sight was never witnessed in the law courts of modern times. "Lately the local authorities," a Kieff journal announces,

> "set about verifying the right of the Jews in Shmerinka to reside there. Many of them were living in little huts of their own. Before the verification took place, however, many of the resident Hebrews deemed it advisable to flee. There are several hundred Jewish houses there, the majority of which were erected, like the palaces of the fairy tales, by night. The work was done in the daytime in bits and scraps, at some distance from the city, and when ready the complete house would be drawn by twenty or thirty pairs of oxen, and set up in the place destined for it. For convenience' sake these houses were made to move about on wheels."†

The poverty of the greater part of the six million Jews who are caged up in the few plague-stricken towns and villages of the Pale surpasses that which excited such a cry of horror in London when the sweating system and its results were dragged into the light of day. The late Minister of Finances, Reutern, declared candidly in a memoir to the Emperor, that "the poverty in which the Jews live is extreme, and the extraordinary demoralisation of the Hebrew race in Russia is mainly the outcome of the extremely unfavorable conditions in which they are placed for gaining a livelihood."‡ The amount of taxes which they owe is enormous.§ It was shown by the census that whereas the average proportion of Christians to the total number of houses owned by Christians in the governments of

---

tribe of Israel. From private sources, however, I learned that things were pretty much as they had always been, . . . but that the far-seeing, provident parents refused to register their births, in order to free them from the necessity, many years thence, of serving in the army."—*The Vilna Messenger*, 11th December, 1887.

* *Novoye Vremya*, 24th December, 1889. These artifices are rendered possible by the important circumstance that in Russia law is not costly, and a man can and generally does conduct his own case, even if he is unable to read or write.

* *Novoye Vremya*, 24th December, 1890.

† Cf. also *Novoye Vremya*, 10th January, 1890.

‡ Cf. Complete Collection of Laws, vol. xl., 42264.

§ *Novoye Vremya*, 10th January, 1890.

the Pale, is between 410 and 510 persons to one house, the average number of Jews is 1,229.* In most parts of the Pale, they are cooped up like insects or animals rather than men. In Berditscheff, the official statistician tells us

> "the Jews are huddled together more like salted herrings than human beings; tens of thousands of them are devoid of any constant means of subsistence, living from hand to mouth; several families are often crowded into one or two rooms of a dilapidated hut, so that at night there is absolutely no space whatever between the sleepers. . . . The lodgers turn these rooms into workshops in the daytime, refining wax therein, making tallow candles, tanning leather, &c.; here whole families live, work, sleep and eat together, in that fetid atmosphere, with their tools and materials lying around on all sides." †

The *Moscow Gazette*, describing the state of the Jews in Berditscheff, says:

> "The streets of the Jewish quarter of the town are not more than four feet wide; on either side of them the tumble-down old houses seem ready to fall to pieces; children are lying before the houses on the street in a state of almost complete nudity, wallowing in the slough, and among them numbers of slovenly women—the mothers of the children—also stretched out sideways and lengthways on the street, sleeping under the rays of the burning sun."

The statistician, M. Bobrovski, writing on the condition of the Jews in the government of Grodno, says:

> "By far the greater part of the Jewish population are poor and are always engrossed by the one care: how to get their daily bread. Burdened with numerous families, the crowded state in which they live surpasses anything one can conceive as possible. Frequently one hut consisting of three or at most four rooms lodges as many as *twelve* families, whose lives are an unbroken series of privations and pains. Whole families sometimes live on three-quarters of a pound of bread, one salt herring, and a few onions." ‡

"In the Government of Kovno,"—and in every government inhabited by the Jews —"there are families who never break their fast till night, and then only if the father and bread-winner had found work to do and has received his wage." §

This, no doubt, is very unsavoury reading, and I inflict as little of it upon my readers as will barely suffice to enable them to form an opinion upon the Jewish question in Russia. Russian Judophobes—many members of the Government included —positively take a pleasure in these disgusting things. And yet what the object of all this persecution is—beyond the one I have already suggested—no man can tell. It is not the Jewish religion that is so unrelentingly pursued, for it is admitted even by the Orthodox Church to be superior to Mohammedanism, which enjoys toleration in Russia. Neither is it the Jewish race, for once a Jew adopts Christianity as his "faith," he is placed on a level with born Christians. It cannot be the supposed economical influence for evil exerted by the Jews, for the same evils complained of, only in much larger dimensions, are to be found in those parts of the Empire in which a Jew never sets foot. And yet, objectless as this persecution evidently is from any reasonable point of view, not only is it warmly advocated by a portion of the press, but a fiendish delight is taken in contemplating the results. The following is a short extract from a description of Vilna, published in the *Vilna Messenger*, a Government organ, and quoted with relish by the *Novoye Vremya*:—

> "All the narratives of travellers about Asiatic and African cities dwindle down to the level of the commonplace in comparison with the sights that meet your eye here; even the glorious city of Berditscheff, the very name of which is become proverbial as a synonym for dirt and rottenness, is as nothing when confronted with this pearl. . . . Glance at the Jewish Synagogue. The dirt in the courtyard is indescribable, the noise and tumult like unto that which accompanied the confusion of tongues. But the atmosphere! You should breathe it, to be able to conceive what it is like. Beside the women's wing of the synagogue are the baths in which the sons and daughters of Israel cleanse their sinful flesh. You can judge of the internal tidiness and cleanliness of these baths by the high dunghill carefully heaped up beside the steps of the entrance." *

But the rest of this foul essay is, at least in parts, too filthy to be given in English. Imagine the Nawab of Bengal sneering at Mr. Holwell and his twenty-two companions for the mephitic atmosphere of the Black Hole of Calcutta, and you have a parallel to the good taste and humanity of Russian Judophobes.

It would be asking for a miracle to expect that men condemned, as are the Russian Jews, to rot away in forced idleness, in Augean filth, breathing air poisoned by the smell of untanned leather, and charged with the noisome exhalations of the dead and dying, to be clean, or even to be merely dirty in the ordinary acceptation of the word. What a harrowing picture of their life does not the following scene conjure up —one of the most pathetic of the tragicomic incidents to which I alluded above? In the middle of the town of Berditscheff there is a large channel or sink in which is thrown all kinds of foul unnameable filth. One day it occurred to a police superintendent that he might have it cleaned out gratis, and he hit upon the following happy expedient: Strolling along the edge of this putrid cesspool, he suddenly stood still and then bent anxiously over the brink, stirring up the filth with his stick. A crowd of Jews soon gathered round him, and inquired what was wrong. He replied that he had dropped a valuable ring worth £25 into the *cloaca*, and he promised a reward to the finder. "In about fifteen minutes," says the journal, "all this putrescent garbage was taken out in handkerchiefs, buckets, pots, rags, &c., and brought *home* by the Jews, who scrutinised it in their courtyards, each one hopeful of finding the ring. And in this way," it concludes, "the superintendent succeeded in *cleansing that canal.*" What extraordinary notions the Russian police must have of the meaning of the word sanitation!

---

* Shooravski Statist., *Description of the Government of Kieff*, vol. i., p. 247.

† *Ibid.*

‡ *Description of the Government of Grodno*, vol. i., p. 858 and fol.

§ Afanassieff, *Description of the Government of Kovno*, pp. 582, 583.

* *Novoye Vremya*, 29th August, 1888.

The majority of the other charges brought against the Jews are in equal good taste. In fairness to both parties, however, it must be admitted that from one fault—or perhaps the word crime would more accurately connote it—it would be difficult to exculpate them; and this partly explains, if it does not justify, the indignation of the Russian Government. I allude to a lack of ardour, amounting at times to a positive aversion on their part, to risk their lives in the service of the Tsar, in return for the rights and protection which they enjoy in Russia. And this, in spite of the solemn oath which they all have to take, "in all things to serve and obey his Imperial Majesty, not sparing in his service my lifeblood, but shedding it, ay, to the last drop,"* in defence of throne and beloved fatherland. This may be perjury and high treason, combined, but, whatever its name and degree, many Jews† are guilty of it. And if that be a satisfactory answer to the charge of undue harshness brought against the Russian Government, there is an end to the matter. At the same time one fails to understand why the Government, which taunts the Jews with being cowards, takes more pains to draw or drive them into the Russian army than if they were so many Hectors and Achilles. Lest a Jew follow what is supposed to be the bent of his inclination and shirk his "sacred duty to his Little Father the Tsar and his dear Fatherland," his personal appearance must be minutely described in his passport in much greater detail than if he were a Christian. Thus every pimple, mole, malformation, and other mark by which he may be identified is to be clearly mentioned!* If the medical commission declare him unfit for service, and the authorities entertain a well-founded or absurd suspicion that he himself deliberately contributed to bring about this unfitness, he is received into the army in spite of his physical defects, and told off for special service.† If, when called upon, a Jew fails to present himself to the military commission whose business it is to accept or reject him, he is not imprisoned. for this would be no punishment to a man whose life is a crownless martyrdom, but heavily fined. This may be a just and certain method of engrafting that love of Fatherland and Little Father which neither their feelings nor their reason have been able to evoke, but it seems needlessly harsh to inflict upon the hard-working old parents of the defaulter a fine of £50 besides; and this is exactly what the law does.‡ But many young men are orphans at this age, or their parents are literally beggars, so that, not possessing a copper coin, they have no fear of the penalties. Such youths ingeniously turn the law to account, and compel it to yield them and their relations a slight profit. They run away from the parish or city in which the commission holds its sittings, and are declared fugitives. For all such deserters—if only they be Jews—a reward of fifty roubles is always liberally paid. A friend of the runaway is informed by the delinquent himself of his whereabouts, he communicates the information to the authorities and receives the reward, which he gives in part or in its entirety to the offender.

In this manner many of the Russian laws against the Jewish population either defeat their own purpose or inflict considerable loss upon the Christian subjects of the Tsar. Thus there are numerous districts in Russia—fertile stretches of land which are in sore need of workmen to till the soil or reap its fruits. It often happens that the corn rots on the ground for want of hands to cut it. The landowners have been for years crying out for some measure calculated to restore what the emancipation of the serfs deprived them of—cheap labour; and the Government did enact a law a few years ago, which has created a class of agricultural labourers who sell themselves for several years, and even descend to the heirs of their master, should he die before the expiration of their term. But this measure has not brought the looked-for relief to Russian landowners, who are often driven to despair at the sight of their riches melting away like snow for want of labourers, while the miserable Jews are perishing of sheer starvation, almost devouring each other, like Ugolino's offspring in the tower of the Gualandi, because there is no work for them to do in the Pale. These hungry wretches are then accused by sleek, over-fed ministers in their warm drawing-rooms, of a disposition to outreach the Russian peasant whenever they have a chance. The accusation, it is to be feared, is not wholly groundless, for Jews belong to the genus animal no less than to the species man, and the instinct of self-preservation is as strongly developed within him when their rival is a Russian as if he were only a vile Jew, like themselves. Men of mild, amiable disposition, tossed about in an open boat on the ocean for a week or ten days, and tortured by the pangs of hunger and thirst, have even been known to harbour wicked thoughts of cannibalism, which the children of Israel in Russia have not yet been known to entertain.

---

* Supplement to art. 1061 (1886).

† The percentage of Jews who neglect to present themselves for military service, or afterwards desert, is larger than that of the Christians; but the difference is not considerable.

* Military Law of 1886. Explanation of Article 8.

† Explanation of Article 40.

‡ Article 350 of the Military Law.

I am personally acquainted with a rich Jew in a flourishing provincial city who is compelled to pay in bribes to the authorities a sum that would support half the Jews of Berditscheff. He raises the necessary amount by imposing an illegal supplementary tax on all *kosher* food sold by him to his co-religionists. His arrangements with the police enable him not only to do this with impunity, but likewise to have all his competitors removed from the city "administratively," that is, by an order issued by the police, without rhyme or reason. These "administrative" orders are much more demoralising than the *lettres de cachet* of the French monarchy, because much more easily obtained. If a Christian have an obliging friend in the police administration, he can treat many Jews of the lower classes just as if they were serfs. I knew a respectable young girl of very honest parents privileged to live in one of the capital cities. A Christian "fell in love" with her, and under pretext of giving her lessons and preparing her for admission to one of the high schools, seduced her, solemnly promising marriage. I heard her once ask him to marry her, and I also heard him reply that he would have her sent out of the city in twenty-four hours for her presumption. And he did. A cousin of his is serving in the police department, and he had no difficulty to obtain an order for her banishment "as a disorderly Jewess." "But how could you bring yourself to do such a damnable act?" I asked. "Oh, she is only a Jewess," he answered. "What else is she good for? Besides, everybody does the same."[*]

Yes; everybody does the same, and the lives of six million people whose instincts, aptitudes, and moral sense place them on a much higher level than their Christian fellow subjects, are thus made literally unendurable. Scoffed at, terrorised, and robbed by every petty official with that certain impunity which invites to crime; insulted, beaten, and kept in constant fear of violence by a vile rabble whom they dare not irritate by even a slight success in business or trade, held up to the scorn and indignation of all Russia by the Governmental press as the authors of every calamity avoidable and unavoidable;[†] education and instruction denied them, the learned professions and higher branch of the profession of arms closed to them; trade and commerce rendered very difficult by intolerable taxes and endless restrictions, and *wholly impossible without bribery and fraud;* their personal liberty now at last completely taken away from them; their religion proscribed, and their very souls killed by the perjury with which they are forced to blacken it, Russian Jews may well defy their persecutors to frame any further laws calculated to make their position worse than it is.

Surely English journalists and politicians carried distrust too far when they doubted the solemn assurances of the Russian Government that no more stringent laws were in contemplation at present, just as the American coroner's jury, finding a paper with the words, "I have killed myself," on the corpse of an inveterate liar, brought in a verdict that he was not dead at all. Still, it is to be regretted that the monster meeting which the Lord Mayor of London was to have convened was not held, as it might have led to some beneficial results; not, of course, by passing impotent resolutions of indignation, which would have had as much effect on the Russian Government as dew-drops on a goose's back, but by respectfully petitioning his Imperial Majesty—as a daily paper lately suggested—to commute in his clemency the present unbearable sufferings to which the law condemns six millions of men and women for worshipping God as Christ did—for painless death by electricity or poison.

---

[*] At present a Jew can be sent out of the city on the ground that he has been *impolite* in the street or in a crowd. And this law has been made by a Governor whose politeness is shown by kicks and cuffs and blasphemous oaths, as the whole south of Russia is well aware.

[†] Cf. *Novoye Vremya*, which published a long article at the time of the accident to the Tsar's train at Borki to show that the danger of sudden death had been brought about by the Jews, while his escape was miraculous and actually foretold by one of the minor Hebrew prophets, who, when read aright, mentions him by name. This same enlightened organ, the most extensively circulated in Russia, also countenanced the fable that the Jews periodically murder a Christian child, whose blood they require for their ceremonies.

DR. LIDDON.

From *The Guardian* (Church of England), London, September 17, 1890.

It is not granted to many men to be both widely famous and widely loved; to wield great power in their public work, and in private life to go on winning to themselves a host of friends among those with whom in any way they have to do. But when it was known eight days ago that Dr. Liddon was dead, there were probably hundreds of people, in all classes of society, on whom, before they could think of the fact that the most remarkable preacher of the English Church would be heard no more, there came a keen and haunting sense of personal impoverishment. That sense reached far beyond the circle of Dr. Liddon's acquaintance. For many a man, whose name, perhaps, he never knew, will for years to come recall the figure that was so well known in London and on the country roads round Oxford; and will think how strangely near he seemed to have been drawn to the great Canon of St. Paul's by a kindly nod and a smile of sheer good will, by a few words of unreasonable gratitude for some little service or courtesy, or by the rendering of quiet and generous help in some time of anxiety and sorrow. The Church of England loses, at a time of grave and manifold anxiety, one who would have feared nothing and grudged nothing in her service; but there are very many, rich and poor, who would have to own that what they felt most vividly last week was that they could never hear again that voice, never see that face, which always brought to them the certainty that there was some one who would be glad to help them if he could.

The fame, for which Dr. Liddon cared so little, and the love, for which he cared so much, both came to him for the same reason. Both were won by the same union in him of characteristics seldom found together—the union of a very fine intellect with a very simple heart. On the one hand, were abilities and acquisitions such as few in Europe could surpass; on the other hand, ordering all these about with a secure, habitual authority, was a very plain motive, which any Christian man might understand. Those who had known him well for many years would often find themselves startled, almost as strangers might be, by the swiftness and splendour of his intellect; but the care he had at heart always was the same, and sometimes was as naively obvious as a child's. The ever-ready penetration which rushed through all that was wrapped round the central quality of a remark, an action, or a book; the power of utterance, as finished and brilliant in its lightest play as in its intensest vehemence, never hesitating, never blundering, never ponderous, and never tired, expressing always exactly and directly what was meant to be expressed, whether it was to a tramp by the roadside, or to the crowd that thronged St. Paul's, or to a group of friends in Common Room, or to a companion in the afternoon walk; the retentive and well-ordered memory, enriched by ceaseless work, with eager interest in all he read and saw; the vivid and adventurous imagination; the invincible sense of humour, coming in sometimes whether he liked it or not, irrepressible, audacious, delightful, and unerring; the strong tenacity with which he held to what he meant, unshaken and unconfused by the doubts of allies or the assaults of enemies:—such were some of the merely intellectual gifts which come to mind as one tries to recall what it was to be with him. "Merely intellectual" he would certainly have called them, with decisive simplicity, if he had ever stayed to give any heed at all to them—mere implements to be employed in a man's work, to be taken care of only that they might be placed at the disposal of his ruling motive, and deriving from that motive absolutely all their real worth. And what, in Dr. Liddon's heart, beyond all that the world praised and criticised and liked and disliked, that enthroned and steadfast motive was, none who knew him well could doubt. It can be told most plainly in St. Paul's words, "That I might by all means save some." Men talked of him as a great orator, a leader among High Churchmen, uncompromising in controversy, and so forth; but the impulse of all his eagerness, the stay of all his determination, was as simple a care for the souls of men as ever filled the heart of a parish priest. That care he never seemed to lay aside. Men, women, and children, as he met them, as he spoke to them, through all external difference, had this one supreme and common interest for him—that he might perhaps make it easier for them to know and do God's will, that he might somehow help forward in their lives the victory of God's love. That unflagging care commanded all the forces he could wield; he lived for it; and it was the secret of much that men might wonder at or fear or love or smile at in his ways. The dominance of that one interest gave a curious uniformity to the view he took of life, of its events and opportunities; and it gave a rare, unworldly courtesy to his dealings with all men. For in all alike he saw the same great drama moving to its vast issue; of all alike, in simplest sincerity, he held himself the slave for Christ's sake. "That I might by all means save some." No one was outside the range of that hope, of that task. The great people whom he came to know, in social or political or literary life; the athletic or pleasure-loving undergraduate on whom he had been asked to call; the poor woman who begged of him in the street; the cleverest man he met in an Oxford Common Room or in a London dinner-party; the servants who waited on him, the tradesmen with whom he dealt; the Arab sailors of his boat upon the Nile; the idle or fussy people who wrote him unnecessary letters; towards all he held himself bound by the very same necessity, and the great appeal that all, through the wide differences that severed them, could make to him was still the same: it was possible that he might somehow help them forward in the knowledge and the love of God. That was the one prospect which kept him, through all times of despondency about things in general, so dutifully, persistently, and generously hopeful about people individually. That was the one task for which he was always ready to spend and to be spent. The moment that his rapid and impetuous logic saw in any measure an impediment to such hopes as these he resolved to withstand it at all hazards and at any cost; and it was the same ever-fresh longing to do all he could do to bring men to God that made him at once the greatest of preachers and the best-loved of friends, that wore him out with work and warfare before he was an old man, and yet kept him to the end, in many ways, as young-hearted as a boy.

It is probable that the constancy of that same intense and restless care caused in large part his loss of love and hope for Oxford in the later years of his life. Perhaps the time has hardly come for measuring the justice of his dark forecasts; it may be many years before the changes he denounced can have their full effect. But, whether he was right or wrong in his estimate of that effect, the heaviest sorrow in his thoughts about the place he once had loved came certainly from this: that he had seen the religious character and mission of Oxford gradually and very seriously impaired; that he believed that that character and mission were virtually destroyed; and that he could not help fearing that an advancing element in modern Oxford loved to have it so. It well may be that other feelings came to aggravate the influence of these convictions. There is no sharper trial for the calmness of a man's judgment than to live on year after year in a society where he has fought hard and has been defeated; and it is weary work to be always in the midst of strife about details, when one believes that the principle of life is gone; and it is very hard under such circumstances to be patient and reticent while people talk as though the place were still the same; but, howsoever the vexation of such trials may have tended to colour his distress and indignation with a deepening despondency, it is probable that there never was in Dr. Liddon's thoughts of Oxford any sadder, more besetting dread than this, that as time went on there would be fewer and fewer men in most of the colleges who could help a lad to live in the fear and love of God, and to take the side of faith in the battle of life. And so, at the very time when he would speak most gloomily of the University he was as keen as ever to do all he could for any undergraduate he knew; he struggled on against fatigue and suffering that he might keep up his voluntary lectures on the Sunday evenings; and after every lecture he would gather round him a group of men and talk to them as only he could talk, while no one ever guessed how tired and ill he was. So, too, he entered with quickening sympathy into the work of any tutor whom he knew to be anxious about the spiritual welfare of his pupils: so he wrote only two years ago to a friend in Oxford:—"To gather in one generation, even if no more is permitted, is a blessing of the highest order. Anything of this sort that individuals can do, in the absence of a pervading Christian system, must be good so far as it goes." "Work (such as this) is useful and blessed everywhere and at all times."

It is scarcely possible to speak here of those truths which, wrought into the very habit of his mind and living in his life, gave form and substance and authority to the one great motive of his work. Yet those who knew and watched him cannot but recall the absolute control with which two great certainties constantly were telling on him. The first was that he was living in the sight of his Lord and Saviour; the second was that he must try to live as he would desire to have lived when he came to die. Those who would measure the intensity in him of that first conviction may see something of it in the last paragraph of the fourth lecture on *The Divinity of our Lord;* the second can be marked in many passages that he has written, and one of them may be cited here:—

"The expectation of a life after death enables us to see things in their true proportions." . . . . "Self magnifies and distorts everything; the true corrective is to be found in the magnificent and tranquilising thought of another life. As men draw near to the threshold of eternity they see things more nearly as they are; they catch perspectives which are not perceived in the days of business and of health. When Bossuet lay a-dying, in great suffering and exhaustion, one who was present thanked him for all his kindness, and, using the court language of the day, begged him when in another world to think of the friends whom he was leaving, and who were so devoted to his person and his reputation. At this last word Bossuet, who had almost lost the power of speech, raised himself from the bed, and gathered strength to say, not without an accent of indignation, 'Don't talk like that. Ask God to forgive a sinner his sins.'"

THE TWO LEGENDS OF DÖLLINGER'S END.

From *The Church Times* (Church of England), London, September 19, 1890.

In our generation the old seem to go faster than the young. Mr. Gladstone, by his valuable article in the *Speaker* on Professor Reusch's "Briefe und Erklärungen von I. von Döllinger über die Vaticanischen Decrete," has seized time by the forelock and anticipated all our editors and reviewers, and made them look like sluggards. A few days after the appearance of the book in Munich, the venerable English political leader, with a leader's instinct in other than political conflicts, perceived its significance, read it through, and sent his interesting and sympathetic account of it to the press. Mr. Gladstone, for many explicable reasons, shrinks from drawing a contrast between the great theologian of his own Oxford and the great theologian of Munich. The contrast is one which must inevitably occupy the future historian of Catholic Christendom in our generation, for it lies at the very heart of the question between Rome and us, as well as between Rome and the Orthodox Christendom of the East. The work just issued by Dr. Reusch, and so rapidly seized and described by our vigorous old ex-Premier, however, is no mere compilation of Döllinger's latest judgments upon the Vatican decrees. It is an *Apologia* which had become a necessity of the hour. It is a defence of the master, by one of the most beloved and like-minded of his disciples, second only to the master in his encyclopædical command of the whole range of Catholic and of modern Roman theology in all branches. Two legends were in swift process of formation concerning the faith in which Döllinger died, and this work was issued to provide the Church of God with history instead of legend.

Dr. von Döllinger had so much about him of the prophet, both in his character and in his unique position, that he could not avoid foreseeing that he was sure to be the subject of the most cruel misrepresentations after his death. He and his disciple, Dr. Reusch, in their common work on the successive casuistical controversies with which the Jesuits poisoned individual and social morality in Western Christendom, pointed out the dexterity with which the rulers of the Company managed that each side in a political or dynastic quarrel should be provided with a Jesuit advocate, so that, whatever the issue might be, the Jesuits could boast of their share in bringing it about, and claim their reward. There is now no distinction between Ultramontanism and Jesuitism; whenever we speak of one, we name the other. The Vatican Council, as Döllinger maintained to the last day of his life, definitely closed the long struggle of old Catholicism against new Jesuitism by the victory of the latter, and by the excommunication of all Catholics who maintained that Ultramontanism is neither religion, nor Christianity, nor Catholicity, but is the caricature of each. The absolute monarchy and infallibility of the Pope are grounded upon an assumption which history and Catholic tradition alike declare to be a lie. The system which has as its substructure and root an historical lie, as Döllinger always plainly called it, a "legend pretending to be history," needs a succession of legendary untruths for its support. Two such legends, or lies, we have lately seen in process of formation concerning the last hours of the most learned Catholic theologian of our century, each of which, although one naturally excludes the other, has had its advocates, and for some time will have its advocates in the Vaticanist camp. The policy of Jesuitism, as Döllinger and Reusch have shown, has always been to "provide for the event," whatever it may be. It keeps an "alternative" in stock. Hence we see the two legends.

First, there is the legend that Döllinger died an impenitent heretic, or, to put it into Jesuit language, he continued to the end to be a rebel against the Divinely-appointed Pope-King of Christ's Kingdom. Secondly, there is the legend that he found a moment of grace before his departure, and died a penitent Catholic; or, in other words, he renounced all that he had believed, written, and taught, and made somehow or other an unwitnessed act of submission to the visible monarch of the Kingdom of Christ. The first legend was invented for the edification of ignorant Roman Catholics, in case it should be necessary for them to regard the educator of so many prelates and priests as the great heresiarch of our generation. Indeed, this legend was developed so fast, and to such a monstrous growth in South Germany, that he was actually "reported," as the Vaticanist *Mainzer Journal* says, "to have died, without spiritual aid, and in a water-closet." The object was too grossly evident. Poor peasants and pilgrims were to believe that the visitation of God, in vengeance for the insults done to His vicar in the Vatican, smote the heresiarch Döllinger exactly as He smote the heresiarch Arius, "Tot auf den Abort gefunden worden." It was doubtless meant to serve also as a negative assertion that the Vatican Council was on a level in all points with the Nicene Council. The further evolution of this infamous legend, this pious fraud, which would have thriven in the ninth century, was instantly arrested in the nineteenth century by plain medical testimony. Decent Roman Catholic papers, to their credit, have protested against this "Report of Döllinger's end," which was started in the city of St. Boniface, the Christian metropolis of Germany. But it is easier to contradict a lie than to kill it, and as the Mainz newspaper refused to withdraw its "report," or to produce evidence for it, it is not improbable that it may survive and flourish amongst the superstitious peasants who believed that the anger of God against Bismarck before he went to Canossa was the real cause of the blight in their potato fields. The Vaticanist controversialists in the press and the pulpit will assert that they never believed it. The scholars and journalists of the party do not share the *Sancta Simplicitas* of the country pilgrims whom they send to the Black Virgin of Einsiedeln, or to the "Holy Grandmother" on the Annaberg, who holds the infant Saviour in one arm and the infant Madonna in the other.

The second legend, which is a flat denial of the first legend, had a better prospect of development in the newspapers, especially amongst Anglicans, Old Catholics, and Protestants. Döllinger, according to the second legend, died a penitent "Roman" Catholic. This equally false legend will be fully met, and disproved by adequate historical and documentary evidence, when the authentic biography of the great modern doctor of Christendom is published. Meanwhile, his learned disciple and fellow-labourer in the *Moralstreitigkeiten*, Professor Reusch, has within the last few days published the valuable body of testimony, which Mr. Gladstone has so speedily reviewed, and which will silence all the fabricators and ready believers of this legend. Under the general title of "Letters and Declarations of J. von Döllinger concerning the Vatican Decrees," he has gathered together a series of documents from Döllinger's pen, chiefly letters to Bishops and to Catholic friends, in which he justifies "the maintenance of an Old Catholic opposition to Ultramontanism and Jesuitism within the Catholic Church, and the importance of upholding the Old Catholic contest and testimony as the means of reconciling all the divided Christian confessions." So Professor Reusch describes the general character of this significant and incontrovertible demonstration that Döllinger was not, even in the *Guardian's* sense, a "Roman" Catholic, and certainly was less of a "Roman" Catholic in Cardinal Manning's sense than some feeble priests in English Orders and some of our young "acrobatic Ritualists" are. The collection is a text-book so full and rich that we cannot do more at present than chronicle its publication, and express a fervent wish for its immediate translation into English.

The book is all the more welcome on account of Professor Reusch's intimation that Döllinger himself had long been thinking of compiling such a testimony. In October, 1886, he wrote a letter to Dr. Reusch, while they were at work upon their joint history of the "Moral Controversies," in which he expressed his sense of the need of a final and definitive demonstration of his own persistent "Anti-Vaticanism," or, as he preferred to call it, his persistent "Old

Catholicism." He said in this letter that suggestions and entreaties to submit himself to the Pope had lately poured in upon him from several quarters. "I have recently had two verbal messages from the Pope," he wrote, "one shortly after the other. I have had a written appeal from the Archbishop of Munich, put into a most courteous and delicate shape: and I have had another written appeal from (Bishop) Hefele. Hence I myself am now feeling most intensely that I owe the world, before the sands of life have run out, the debt of a thorough explanation and declaration. There is still so much left to be said in this matter which has not as yet been said, or has been said in a language and a form which were *far too feeble*." Döllinger was under the impression that the work upon which he and Reusch were then engaged was a complete burning of the bridge between himself and the Roman Pontiff, as indeed the Roman controversialists at once recognised it to be. "Rome's influence," he wrote to the Old Catholic priest and university professor, Michelis, before the death of the latter, "has been very much more hurtful and ruinous than I had been able to conceive before 1860. I have again travelled, so to speak, throughout the whole territory of Church history, and this study has produced as its result incontrovertible proof upon proof of the falsehood of the Vatican decrees." Amongst the most instructive of the documents just published by Dr. Reusch is the correspondence, three years ago, between the Papal Nuncio Ruffo Scilla and Döllinger, and also Döllinger's long and powerful reply, four years ago, to the Archbishop of Munich, who flatteringly wrote to the great theologian, in July, 1886, "Your return to the Church of God would be a happy day to her Supreme Pastor, a day of jubilee to millions of the faithful, and a joy to the choirs of the blessed!" But that individualist act of submission to the Pope, which the Archbishop regarded as the return of a prodigal son to the father in Rome, was regarded by Döllinger as an act of apostasy from the faith once delivered to the saints. That "apostasy" was never committed, as the Vatican knows only too well; but it is naturally anxious to delude Anglicans and Protestants with the legend that its greatest foe in our century "died a Roman Catholic." A long time must pass before Döllinger's biography is published, and events have shown that there is a readiness abroad to believe the insulting legend which Dr. Reusch, by his timely intervention, has destroyed.

ROMANISTS ON RITUALISTS.

From *The Rock* (Church of England), London, September 19, 1890.

THE growing assimilation of Ritualism to genuine Romanism would perhaps lead us to expect that the Roman Catholic Press and the Bishops and Clergy of that communion in this country would commend those who are doing their work within the Church of England. Such, however, is not always the case. However they may be dealt with privately and individually, the Ritualists as a party are more commonly in public held up to reproach and ridicule by those from whom they might look for different treatment. We can seldom take up the *Tablet* or the *Catholic Times*, or read articles by Romish controversialists in the popular magazines, without finding severe and sarcastic notices of the opinions and practices of extreme High Churchmen. A few specimens of this kind may serve to draw attention to the fact and suggest an inquiry into the motives which may prompt these attacks. For be it remembered this attitude of Romanists towards Ritualists must be distinguished from their views as to whether the Ritualists are paving the way towards Rome. An ambitious monarch may patronise whilst he despises the rebel conspirators in that neighbour's kingdom which he wishes to subjugate.

The meeting of some one hundred and fifty clergy in London to consider what action they should take in anticipation of the Primate's judgment in the Bishop of Lincoln's case afforded occasion to the *Catholic Times* to pass some scathing comments on this inconsistency in appealing, as some of them did, to "Œcumenical authority." "They talk," it says, "of a Provincial Synod, knowing well that the Archbishop of Canterbury will no more dare to summon a Provincial Synod than he would dare to assume command of the army; and that, if such a Synod were to assemble to-morrow, it would scoff at Œcumenical authority, and would condemn High Church doctrines and practices alike. Subterfuge after subterfuge, quibble after quibble, is the method of the Ritualistic Clergy." So, again, the attempts now made in Convocation, under the impulse of the same party, to revive Monastic Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods with dispensable vows, meets with scant sympathy from the Romish press. "On what principle," it is asked, "do High Churchmen, who point with pride to the Anglican Sisterhoods as a proof of their Catholicity, treat with cold disdain and neglect the Abbot of Llanthony and his fellow-monks? We imagine the principle which the Anglican Bishops act upon is simply this: it is convenient to adopt the Sisterhoods, for they are popular; it is not convenient to recognise Father Ignatius." Still more biting was the sarcasm with which the *Tablet* wrote on "Anglicanism and Image Worship" at the time when St. Paul's reredos and its life-size image of the Virgin were in question. The *Tablet* then informed its readers that "There exists an authorised collection of sermons, which the Clergy are now permitted to read, and which under conditions they were once enjoined to read to their flocks in lieu of their own compositions. These sermons are the homilies of the Church of England, and every clergyman who subscribes the Thirty-nine Articles subscribes at the same time to an unreserved consent to them as 'containing a godly and wholesome doctrine necessary for these times.'" After these remarks the writer quoted at length from the homily against peril of idolatry and superfluous deckings of churches. The contrast between the principles and the practice of the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's was thus exhibited. "*Fas est et ab hoste doceri.*"

On another occasion the *Tablet* fell foul of the Ritualists in these terms: "The curious pretensions of the Ritualistic party in the Church of England are gradually being laid bare in their marked and complete absurdity. Their determination to keep the wages of the Establishment for doing what it forbids looms out with wonderful clearness. . . . Every parson of the Establishment is to be allowed to wander at his own sweet will, and preach what doctrine he chooses, because the 'Spirituality' was not consulted about the establishment of the present Court of Appeal." It would be easy to multiply quotations of this kind. We rather hasten to ask, What is their drift and intention? Can it be that Rome looks on with scorn and indifference at the steady advance made by her friends towards the houses of rest and peace? This would be unnatural and incredible. The pæans recently sung over the "Silver Jubilee" of Cardinal Manning, and the extravagant eulogies pronounced over the grave of Cardinal Newman, are sufficient proofs of her appreciation of such illustrious and highly-gifted proselytes. Even the arrival in the fold just now of a young Sheffield curate has been hailed with great joy. It is said that Mr. Thorpe is a nephew of the Archbishop of Canterbury. If there could have been a doubt on this point, the Romish Bishop of Salford, at the recent conference of the "Catholic Truth Society" in Birmingham, made it perfectly plain how English Romanists regard this Romeward movement. In an outburst of sanguine anticipation he said that no impartial observer can contrast the England of the past with the England of to-day without declaring that the mind and heart and policy of the country have swung at least half-way round towards the Catholic Church. Whilst some of us have been straining our minds and hearts in one direction, shaking our heads and lamenting because the conversions are so few, behold, the whole country has become converted without observation. If the progression of change be at the same rate during the next sixty years as during the past, before the end of the next century England may be practically Catholic again. He also asserted with boastful arrogance, but, alas! with too much truth, that "the bishops, ministers, and people of the Church of England are busily engaged in ignoring or denouncing those very Articles which were drawn up in this eternal protest against the old religion. The statue of the Blessed Virgin Mary has been put up with honour over the principal side entrances to Westminster Abbey, and she has been recently enthroned under the dome of St. Paul's." We have in previous articles estimated the value of these idle vaunts. Our object here is not to appreciate or controvert them, but to contrast them with the strain of invective and ridicule usually indulged in on this subject by the Romish press in England. It certainly seems at first sight difficult to reconcile the one attitude with the other. For the clue we must look below the surface, since things are not always what they seem. It may be that in the Romish camp there is a feeling of disappointment that so few have crossed the rubicon of late years and actually gone over to Rome. They see many, through the present laxity of discipline, allowed to teach and practise Romanism within our Church, but they are men who will not bow to authority either within or without her pale. This, to a zealous and loyal Roman Catholic, appears an anomalous and despicable position. His own Church exacts absolute and unqualified submission. No half measures can there be tolerated. They that join its standard must accept all or nothing.

There is in such utterances a warning voice to both individuals and to the country at large. Both the reproaches and the rejoicings of the Romish Press are significant. The position of the Ritualistic party is seen by all, except by themselves, to be increasingly false and inconsistent. There is no doubt a gradual process of leavening and undermining going on, which, if it do not soon receive a decided check, is fraught with calamity to both the Church and State of England. We have hope, however, that at least moderate High Churchmen will have their eyes opened; may we also hope that earnest and thoughtful Ritualists—for there are such—will perceive the unnatural and strained relations which they are producing, and will feel that they must either honestly, like Cardinal Newman, go over bodily to Rome, or else revert to the old lines, and to good Protestant principles? The Romish rule is at least logical: the Ritualist attempt to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds would be absurdly grotesque were it not so deplorably mischievous.

THE REV. GEORGE B. CHEEVER, D.D., PREACHER AND PHILANTHROPIST.

BY AUGUSTUS.

From *The New York Observer*, October 9, 1890.

THE death of the Rev. George Barrell Cheever, D.D., which took place October 1, removes a man whose life and influence have been powerful in literature, theology and moral reform for more than half a century. Full of years, respected and honored even by bitter opponents, he kept on working till a few weeks before his death, when he took to his bed, and spent his last hours in prayer. Dr. Cheever was born in Hallowell, Me., April 17, 1807. His father was a printer and publisher, and his grandfather, Nathaniel Cheever, of Salem, Mass., is said to have been the first man whose blood was shed in the Revolutionary war. Inheriting literary tastes from his father and grandfather, together with religious inclinations, he early devoted his attention to literature of a pure and inspiring nature, and was a reader of religious and thoughtful books while a mere boy. He was educated at Hallowell Academy and at Bowdoin College, and was in the class of 1825, together with Longfellow, Nathaniel Hawthorne, the historian J. S. C. Abbott, Senator J. W. Bradbury, Representative Jonathan Cilley, and other notable men. His religious and intellectual tendencies led him naturally to seek the pulpit, and he entered upon ministerial studies at Andover and remained in the Theological Seminary there until his ordination in 1830.

During the time spent as a theological student he contributed several articles to *The United States Literary Gazette* and *The American Monthly Magazine.* His literary style developed rapidly, and before he had completed his studies at the seminary articles from his facile pen were welcomed by *The Biblical Repository* and *The North American Review.* He also compiled the popular American Commonplace Books of Prose and Poetry, and edited the Select Works of Archbishop Leighton. He was settled as a pastor at Newburyport, and went from there to the Essex street Congregational church, Boston, and in 1833, when only twenty-six years of age, he assumed the pastorate of the Howard street church, Salem.

Soon after his settlement he entered with great earnestness into the Unitarian controversy, and wrote a "Defence of the Orthodoxy of Cudworth," which made him many enemies whose hostility was developed upon his trial later on. As a champion of temperance reform he sought to prohibit the manufacture and sale of rum, and wrote for the Salem *Landmark* an allegory entitled, "Inquire at Deacon Giles's Distillery." This created considerable stir at Salem and through the country at large. Soon after its publication the *Landmark* office was attacked at night, and the author of the article assaulted at midday in the public street by the foreman of a Salem distillery. Dr. Cheever was indicted for a libel upon Deacon John Stone, of Salem, who owned a large distillery in the town, and who was supposed to be the model which Dr. Cheever used in creating "Deacon Amos Giles." Dr. Cheever was tried before a jury evidently hostile to him, and sentenced by a judge who had little sympathy for an orthodox clergyman, to thirty days' imprisonment in the common jail.

Rufus Choate defended Dr. Cheever upon his first trial, and he made a brilliant speech in his own behalf before the final sentence. Before entering upon his defence, Dr. Cheever solemnly reiterated his plea of not guilty to the indictment preferred against him. . . . He then proceeded to the justification and defence of the article charged as libellous, on the ground that it was never written or intended for Deacon Stone or any individual, the allusions to known truth not having been introduced, as avowed in the indictment, for the purpose of a personal, malicious application. It was no part of his object, in the composition of that article, to defame, vilify, or injure the character of any particular distiller whatever, or to bring indignation or disgrace upon any one's family connections. The object of the piece was to portray, in as strong a light as possible, the real nature and consequences of the manufacture of ardent spirits in a distillery. The conception of the character of the deacon was purely imaginary, and never intended to be applied to any individual whatever. The doctrines which the deacon of the dream was described as having heard preached were grouped together, not to mark an individual, but partly because he knew that the tendency of those doctrines was to lull the conscience in sin, and partly because he supposed that the evangelical churches throughout the country had very generally adopted the resolution that the traffic in ardent spirits is an immorality, so that it would be difficult to find any such Church retaining in its communion, especially in the sacred office of deacon, a professor of religion who persists in getting his living by the vices, miseries and diseases of his fellowmen.

He contended that in the eye of the law there was nothing in the allusions of the piece which could be considered libellous, for there was nothing in them of untruth; nor was there aught of malice or inimical intention in their introduction as portions of the article. For the defence of their use, he threw himself on the protection of the statute which makes their truth a justification, alleging the importance of the object which he had in view, and the purity of motive with which he had presented it.

He contended that malice was an essential ingredient in a libel, and that there must be extensive evidence of it; which the government had entirely failed to produce. He said that the *prima facie* evidence on the article itself was not that of malice, but that of its having been written to aid the cause of temperance, and that a verdict against the defendant could never have been obtained under the protection of the statute, unless the jury were charged to bring him in guilty, whatever were his motives. If any man was at a loss for a motive, he begged him to contemplate for a moment the nature of the traffic in ardent spirit, and the ruinous tendency of the business of distilling. He contended that there must be liberty for the use of illustrations from actual life, and reference to actual occurrences in our efforts to advance the cause of temperance, and that the liberty of the press is a mockery, if the truth may not be told of every man's occupation. The law on libel was never made for the protection of men's sins or immoral practices. Disgrace, he said, was the inevitable tax that every man pays to society, who chooses to make his living out of other men's sins. The conjunction of Rum and Bibles in the very nature of the inconsistency was irresistibly ridiculous, and any man would be justified for censuring it.

He went on to a full statistical detail of the evils resulting from the manufacture and use of ardent spirit. Especially he dwelt upon the consequences to the souls of men in eternity. The declaration that no drunkard shall enter the kingdom of God is, after all, he said, the one on which depends the great guilt of the manufacture, the sale, and the use of ardent spirit. In every stage of the business it is no more nor less than the incessant preparation of human souls for hell. The Attorney-General, he said, knew well that he did not need the authority of the Vatican for the declaration of this awful truth. It rested on a higher than any earthly authority, the Word of God.

These statements, Dr. Cheever said, he made as a complete justification of the article for which he was arraigned, and for the purpose of recalling to the mind of the Court the dreadful nature and alarming prevalence of the evil against which it was directed. After further speaking of the traffic in ardent spirit as an opposed barrier to the spread of Christianity, and the agency of the distillery in destroying the power of those moral and religious truths on which the whole well-being of our country depends—he proceeded to declare that however he might be persecuted, his lips should not be silent on the enormity of this traffic; but that while he lived, he should continue, perhaps with more prudence for the lesson he had learned, to rebuke the sin. He spoke of the difficulty in coming at the deep-rooted causes of intemperance. The old ways were worn out, and strong and sharp instruments were needed. He reminded the Court of the course which had been taken by the Attorney-General in discharging two of the individuals engaged in the assault upon his person. He solicited the favor of the Court upon manly ground, and asked for an acquittal because he was guiltless of the crime of a personal libel on Deacon Stone. He concluded as follows:—

"Could the amount of misery, in time and eternity, which any one distillery in Salem has occasioned, be portrayed before your honor, I should feel no solicitude as to the result. Let the mothers that have been broken-hearted, the wives that have been made widows, the children that have been made fatherless, the parents borne down with a bereavement worse than death in the vices of their children, be arrayed in your presence; let the families reduced to penury, disgraced with crime, and consumed with anguish, that the owners of one distillery might accumulate their wealth, be gathered before you. Let the prosecutor in this suit go to the graveyards and summon their shrouded tenants; let him summon before you the ghosts of those whose bodies have been laid in the grave from one distillery; let him call up, if he could, the souls that have been shut out from heaven and prepared for hell, through the instrumentality of the liquor manufactured there; and let him ask what is *their* verdict. Need I suppose the judgment? Surely it would be said, let the defendant be shielded. Even if he has overstepped the limits of exact prudence in his efforts to portray the evils of intemperance, in the name of mercy let the great object of the effort shield *him*, and let the law be turned against *that dreadful business*, whose nature he has aimed to delineate."

Upon his release from prison, he resigned his pastorate and went to Europe, contributing letters to the *New York Observer* from England, Spain, and other countries. Upon his return he accepted a call from the Allen street Presbyterian church of this city, where he distinguished himself by a discussion with Bishop Hughes on "Hierarchical Despotism," in which he maintained that the Bible should not be excluded from the public schools. He also delivered a course of lectures on the "Pilgrim's Progress," afterwards published in book form. His health becoming impaired, he visited Europe again in 1844, and published the result of his travels in several volumes which were largely circulated. He returned in 1846, and was for a time editor of *The New York Evangelist*. The Church of the Puritans was now formed, and Dr. Cheever invited to become its pastor. An elegant white marble church was built in Union Square where the Tiffany warehouse now stands. After Dr. Cheever's retirement from the ministry, this building was sold, taken down carefully, and transferred by the Baptist Society which purchased it, to West Fifty-third street, where it still stands. During all this time Dr. Cheever had appeared many times as a lecturer, and had published poems, religious works, and others directed against slavery. After the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the passage of the Fugitive Slave law, and the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, the pulpit of the Church of the Puritans became a centre of attraction to all who sought the abolition of slavery. The church was crowded to the doors with men thronging to hear the preacher, who, with the earnestness and manner of an ancient prophet, denounced slaveholders as well as the system, and attacked without reserve all who apologized for the owners of slaves or upheld the laws which protected slavery in the United States. Many of Dr. Cheever's parishioners objected to his course and to the hospitality extended to the Church Anti-Slavery Society, an organization which favored nonfellowship with slaveholders. In the summer of 1860 Dr. Cheever went to England with a commission from his Church to represent its position to British Christians. A year later he returned home and continued his warfare upon slavery, preaching on several occasions in the United States Senate Chamber and in the hall of the House of Representatives on "The Rights of the Colored Race to Citizenship and Representation."

The Church of the Puritans declined in membership after the war was over, its property was sold and a large part of the proceeds were given to the Presbyterian church at Harlem, which took also the name, and Dr. Cheever retired in 1867 to live in Englewood, having given his city house to the American Board of Missions and the American Missionary Association. But he did not retire from literary or philanthropic work. Within the present year he has contributed to the columns of the *New York Observer*, and though more than fourscore years of age, he could not keep silent when righteousness needed a defender, or wrong a powerful opponent.

He was by nature a polemic and a champion, but his heart was full of charity and kindness even for those whom he denounced. He was most amiable and charitable in private life, and gave generous gifts to all good works, and especially to home and foreign missions. His books would make a little library, but are mainly reproductions of lectures, essays, sermons and letters previously published. He died at his home, Englewood, New Jersey, where he had lived honored and beloved for the past twenty years, and was buried in Greenwood beside his wife, who preceded him to rest four years ago, after having been his companion through a long life.

THE AMERICAN BOARD.

One Change that all will Approve.

BY REV. HENRY FAIRBANKS, PH.D., ST JOHNSBURY, VT.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, October 2, 1890.

The questions relating to "methods of administration" by the American Board are receiving careful consideration by the able committee appointed to report upon them, and a public discussion of them now would be manifestly untimely. There is, however, one simple and comparatively slight change suggested, of such evident advantage that it would be well that all friends of the Board should have their attention called to it, especially as it is entirely independent of partisan interest. I refer to the method of conducting the personal and theological examination of candidates for missionary appointment.

When the Board refused to sanction a reference to a council of churches of the question of theological fitness for appointment, it was with the distinct understanding that this question was left with the Prudential Committee, upon the alleged ground of their ability and fitness.

It was of course understood that the question to be decided by them in each case was not ecclesiastical, determining fellowship or recognition as ministers, but purely prudential, namely, whether the views of the candidate were so nearly the same as the average views of the contributors who would be called upon to support him that he would preach the truth which they give their money to propagate. Their function is like that of a parish or church business committee who would select a minister whose views of truth accord with those of the people who employ him.

The vote of the Board gave the determination of this question to the Prudential Committee, a body at least equal in ability, and perhaps in number, to the average council. But, in order that the Committee may have the same opportunity to act fairly and wisely that the ordinary council has, the candidate should come before it in the same way, and, along with his statement, make his personal impression.

No council could safely, or would, depute its moderator and scribe to examine a candidate for ordination by correspondence, or privately, and then at an adjourned meeting act upon their report. The method is objectionable, and would prove dangerous. The moderator would write asking the candidate to be free and tell him all his thought, and whether he had any unusual theory, or any doubt as to any of the doctrines of the orthodox system. A dull man would say no. A morbidly conscientious man, or a man given to thinking for himself, would remember some perplexities, some questions; would be reminded that some things which on the whole he believed, were not as clear to him as others. Though he had never had doubts to be mentioned to professors or fellow-students, he perhaps would have to say, when urged to be perfectly frank, that sometimes sin seemed to him so fearful a thing, and the doom of the finally impenitent so terrible, that the soul could hardly continue to bear such suffering—it might lose its sensitiveness, it might shrivel, in that flame. If he made such an answer orally before a council, a very little questioning would prove him really unsound, or else would bring out the fact that he held no false view, and that his hesitation to strongly affirm the eternal conscious suffering of the wicked grew out of a most intense conception of the awful guilt of sin, which led to an equally intense apprehension of the wonder of the atonement, and a consecration of all his powers to the work of saving the lost. But, having confessed his hesitation to fully affirm, the conscientious examiner of course inquires just how and why he doubts.

The candidate has written that he doubts, and, having to write again, he must explain and defend his doubt. And so that doubt is strengthened in his own mind, and, being defended, becomes so prominent in his letters that, when the long correspondence is read, the man seems to have more interest in what was at first only a slight uncertainty than in the whole body of truth.

The moderator, however much interested in him, cannot do less than to ask him to consent to have the final submission of his case to the council deferred until his views are so clarified that he is able to write that he believes in the eternal conscious suffering of the lost. This he cannot fully affirm, and every letter that he has written has made it more impossible. The method of examination has made him a defender of a false theory, and the council, if it reassembles, cannot ordain him without indorsing a false view.

The correspondence method is a most effective agency in leading one who has any doubts to commit himself to their defense, and to move him further toward error than he intended. Some doubt which merely implied ignorance, or lack of interest in perhaps a side doctrine, crystallizes into the false opinion that seems defensible. The method generates heresy.

Now in the case of an applicant for missionary appointment, it would seem to be perfectly feasible to secure the requisite testimonials, and certificate of physician, and then to allow the candidate to appear before the Prudential Committee and state how he is prompted to enter the service, and what are his views of truth. As determining fitness for missionary service, a personal presentation is worth more than scores of letters, and as determining "the amount and spiritual force" of any acknowledged doubt, it is incomparably better.

It may be thought that the committee has not time for meeting all candidates, or even all who are expected to preach or teach in the higher departments, but generally a rather brief examination would enable them to understand the spirit and faith of a man, and it is doubtful whether more of the time of the Committee would necessarily be taken with each case than is generally used under the present system.

The fact that the candidate may now have a hearing with the Committee if he requests it is of small advantage, for this is expected only in cases which have already made an unfavorable impression, where the unfortunate method has already wrought its bad results.

Another evil result of the present system is the ill feeling that has been cultivated against the home secretary. It may be that the attack is directed against an individual because that is the most effective and cheapest way to injure the party or the principles which he is understood to represent. But it is unfair and needless to continue a system which makes one man the official curator of the theological soundness of the envoys of the churches, while the honored Committee see only through his eyes and hear only through his ears. It is unjust to expose any man to the attacks which any conscientious discharge of such duties must bring upon him; it is unsafe to trust the wisest man with such responsibility; it is dangerous to expose the interests of the truth to suffer if the attack upon one man can succeed.

Studying this whole subject, I believe that nine-tenths of the embarrassing difficulties of these recent years would have been avoided if candidates for missionary appointment had been allowed to make their first statement of Christian experience, reasons for entering the service, and views of Biblical truth, in the hearing of the whole Committee. To relieve the secretary from needless exposure and his views of truth from harmful attack, to relieve candidates from the danger of being led into serious error by the defense of some slight doubt, and to give the Board the advantage of the wisdom of the Committee to whom it refers the question of the theological fitness of candidates for missionary service, it is most important that these candidates be examined in the presence of the Committee rather than by correspondence.

HOW TO BE A GOOD HEARER.

BY WM. M. TAYLOR, D.D.

From *The Advance* (Congregational), Chicago, October 9, 1890.

We have had in recent days a good deal of criticism of the pulpit, and for my part, I am not disposed to quarrel with that when it is intelligent, discriminating and just. But it is only seldom that anything is said about the hearers. We have had also "Lectures on Preaching," in which many have given the lessons of their experience for the guidance of those who are preparing for the ministry, and certainly I should be one of the last to find fault with these. But it is almost time now, in my judgment, that some good, wise, and faithful layman should give a course of "Lectures on Hearing," and tell his brethren in the pews how they can hear to edification, while at the same time he informs preachers what particular sorts of sermons have done him the most good. I dare not presume to do anything of that kind, but while our lay brother is getting ready, I may try to give a few hints on the subject that may be of service to my readers.

There should, in the first place, be some preparation made for getting what an old Scottish Christian used to call "a good hearing." For the hearing of the Gospel is not an isolated act in a man's life. It is connected with, and depends very largely on, many other things. If, for example, during the week, he is entirely absorbed in business, and never permits himself to think of spiritual and eternal matters, the presumption is that he will bring his business into the sanctuary on the Lord's day, and if he do, the eloquence of an Apollos will not avail to drive it away. But if during the week he has been trying faithfully to transact his business for God, he will be ready on the Lord's day to listen to the message which God in his providence has sent him through the lips of his pastor. If again he never thinks of his minister from the moment when, on the one Sabbath, he leaves the church porch, to that when, on the next, he enters it again, it is almost certain that the service will be a weariness to him, and his listening will be listless and indifferent.

Thus interest in the hearing of God's Word preached on the Lord's Day will depend on the maintenance of devotional habits during the week. The pastor at his ordination and installation is "charged" to be a man of prayer, and that is right. He never can be a faithful minister otherwise. But it is equally important that the hearer should be the same. He will never get the full benefit of a sermon unless he is so, and, on the other hand, if out of love to his Saviour and to his pastor, he prays daily that a blessing may be sent to him through the pulpit, he will be eagerly on the watch in the pew for the answers to these prayers, and he will never watch in vain.

But if this be true of the week as a whole, it is especially so of the Lord's Day morning. That ought not to be a time of bustle and hurry, but rather one of quiet thought and prayer. The reading of the morning should be either in the Scriptures themselves, or in one of those classics of the closet wherewith devout men have enriched our literature. Half an hour, then, with such a book as Phelps's "Still Hour," or Matheson's "My Aspirations," or Leighton's "Commentary on First Peter," or Tholuck's "Hours of Christian Devotion," or, better than any other, the Book of Psalms, will prepare the soul for the descent into it of the Holy Spirit, and that will make the hearing in the sanctuary both profitable and delightful. How much better as a preparation for the hearing of the gospel is an exercise like that than the perusal of the Sunday newspaper! I suppose that there is really more Sunday work on the Monday morning's paper than on that of the Sunday, but what must be the dissipating effect of having the mind filled with all sorts of incongruous subjects just before going to the house of prayer! I cannot speak from experience here, but I am sure that few things would more thoroughly unfit me for preaching than to rise from my newspaper and rush into the pulpit, with the same precipitancy as I fear many throw down their Sunday papers and hurry to the church, only to find that in spite of all their haste they are too late after all! Of old it was, "when the dew fell all round about the camp, that the manna fell upon it." The moisture of the dew, as it would seem, was needed to fix and detain the manna. And so the influences of the Holy Spirit on the heart are required to fix in it, and keep in it, the Word read or heard. But the Spirit does not usually descend amid such surroundings and occupations as I have just described, and therefore we should seek to have before hearing a time of devotional quietude on the morning of the first day of the week.

But now let us come to the actual hearing. It is surely self-evident to say that we ought to hear with attention. That which the preacher takes into the pulpit for you, at least, be he worthy of his office, is the very best that he can produce. He has prepared it as in God's sight. He has given to it thought and prayer. It has been given to him in God's providence with some special purpose that concerns either his hearers as a whole, or some individuals among them. Therefore their attitude should be that described in the words of Cornelius to Peter, "Now, therefore, we are all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God." *All here present before God.* What words are these! The preacher ought to remember them as well as the hearers, and the hearers as well as the preacher. That will make him earnest and it will make them attentive. For public worship is no mere matter of form. It is a being "together before God." Therefore the preacher will "stir up the gift that is in him," and the hearer will rouse himself to listen. He will train himself to follow the speaker. He will not allow any alluring association to draw his mind away from the truths which are put before him. He will leave his business behind him for the time. He will forget to criticise the earthiness of the vessel, because of his eagerness to get at the treasure which it contains. He will recognize that in the providence of God's Spirit, there is something in the daily ministration specially designed for him, and he will watch most closely lest he should miss that. He will regard his hearing as an opportunity, and he will seek to make the most of it as such. And if the preacher should be undeniably dry and unedifying, he will try to take the consolation presented by the good George Herbert in these lines:

Judge not the preacher, for he is thy judge.
 If thou mislike him thou conceiv'st him not.
God calleth preaching folly. Do not grudge
 To pick out treasures from an earthen pot.
The worst speak something good; if all want sense,
God takes a text and preaches patience.

But it is equally important that we should hear for ourselves. Many are exceedingly benevolent with what they hear. They give the whole sermon away to others, and keep nothing for themselves. As point after point is made, they say within themselves, "I hope A. B. is here, that suits *him* exactly. What a description that is of C. D., surely he cannot fail to recognize himself as he listens, and it would be edifying to know what he thinks of his portrait. What a lesson that is for E. F., but as likely as not she is too much occupied with taking an inventory of her neighbor's articles of dress, to hear anything about it;" and so on and so on. Now that is all very benevolent, *in a sense*, but it is a benevolence that is rooted in self-conceit. It is, besides, akin to malice, and it doth not "minister grace to the hearer." In this matter we must keep everything to ourselves, and those are the most profitable discourses in listening to which the hearer is most frequently constrained to say, "That means me."

But once more we ought to hear with independence. The preacher is not to do our thinking for us, but to stimulate us to think and determine for ourselves. His teachings are to be accepted by us only so far as they are in harmony with the sacred Scriptures. His interpretations of these Scriptures are neither inspired nor infallible, and therefore they must be tested and judged by each of his hearers for himself. It might, no doubt, be a convenient thing to have some one to make application for us of the principles of the Bible, in every perplexing case of conduct or casuistry that arises in our experience, but that is not the way taken by the Lord to discipline his people into strength. To have a spiritual director to tell us always what precisely we should do, and what we should avoid, would make and keep us weak as babes. Therefore no intelligent hearer should allow a fellow-man, even if he be a preacher, to dictate to him, either what he is to believe, or how, in certain case, he is to act. Of course what the preacher says should not be rejected without careful examination. If the examination sustains him his teaching should be gratefully received; but if it do not sustain him, it should be rejected. Everything heard from the pulpit should be weighed in "the balance of the sanctuary," and they who act upon this principle will receive the commendation given to the Bereans "who received the word with all readiness of mind and searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so." A congregation of such hearers will stimulate any right-minded preacher to give them of "the finest of the wheat," and under his influence they will become both intellectually, morally and spiritually, leaders of the community in the midst of which they dwell.

It only now remains to say a word or two of that which should come after hearing. Food must be digested as well as eaten. Now what digestion is to eating, that meditation is to hearing. It assimilates what we hear, and makes it contribute to our growth in grace. But alas! meditation is rapidly becoming a "lost art." A great living English preacher has said, "I, for my part, believe that there are few Christian duties more neglected than meditation. the very name of which has fallen into a comparative disuse that argues ill for the frequency of the thing. We are so busy discussing, defending, inquiring or preaching and teaching that we have no time and no leisure of heart for quiet contemplation, without which the exercise of the intellect upon Christ's truth will not feed, and busy activity, even in Christ's cause, may starve the soul." Let us therefore cultivate this neglected exercise. Willmette in his "Hints on Reading" has said, "Proportion one hour's reflection to one hour's reading and so dispirit the book into the student." So I would say, let every time of hearing be followed by a time of meditation.

Then after meditation comes action. To hear week after week without seeking to carry out what we hear, will only harden the heart. But to keep the conduct abreast of the conviction produced in us by hearing will make us better hearers as we advance. When our errors are discovered to us, let us give them up. When our evil courses are pointed out, let us go in them no more. When our sins are brought home to us, let us repent of them and return unto the Lord. I have heard Mr. Spurgeon tell of a woman who on being asked what text her pastor had preached from on the preceding Sunday, replied that she could not exactly remember it, but it was something about false measures. "What sort of a sermon did he give?" "Well," said she, "I can't tell you much about the sermon, but when I came home I went straight away and burned the bushel." Depend upon it, that woman got still more benefit from the next sermon she heard, and if only we would go and do likewise after every Sabbath service there would be less complaint of the decadence of the pulpit. I conclude with quoting the words of the Apostle James:

"Let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath; for the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God. Wherefore putting away all filthiness, and overflowing of wickedness, receive with meekness the implanted word which is able to save your souls. But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deluding your own souls. For if any one is a hearer of the word and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a mirror: for he beholdeth himself and goeth away, straightway forgetting what manner of man he was. But, he that looketh unto the perfect law, the law of liberty, and so continueth, being not a hearer that forgetteth, but a doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing."

Broadway Tabernacle, New York.

THE CATHOLICS AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

BY HOWARD CROSBY, D.D., LL.D.

From *The National Baptist*, Philadelphia, September 18, 1890.

THE *Independent* of Sept. 4 gives a symposium on this subject from eminent men in different denominations. We quote as much as our limits will permit:

"The United States became a nation on the fundamental principle of religious liberty. Other nations had reached the point of religious toleration, but none had adopted a system of religious liberty. Toleration implies a State religion. Liberty implies no State religion. Religion is left to the individual and his conscience. Accordingly no special form of religion can be in any way fostered by governmental aid. The least patronage of a religious sect is a violation of religious liberty. Religions must grow from their own vitality and not from State culture. This is not only the sole condition of religious liberty, but it is the most favorable condition of religion itself. State interference must always mar religion, however much it may give it the appearance of prosperity. State interference brings in the discordant element of politics, detrimental to all religion.

"It is from these premises we insist that religion must never be taught in our public schools. Any form of religious teaching must have a sectarian character as against other forms; and to that degree such teaching in our public schools would be a violation of our national principle of religious liberty.

"Because a devout Christian would like to have all American children instructed in the evangelical doctrine, he has no more right to have it taught in the public schools than a devout Jew, in his ardent desire to have all American children instructed in Judaism, has to have the Talmud taught in the public schools. In either case religious liberty is violated. The piety that would force such instruction is of the same sort that burned Giordano Bruno.

"The public school should have as its one object the preparation of the child to form an intelligent member of the State. For this he must know how to read and write and compute numbers, and must become acquainted with the history and institutions of his country. There the public school has exhausted its function.

"Moral influence should be exerted constantly on the pupil by moral teachers; but this morality is what is admitted by all citizens, the morality of truth, justice and purity as consonant with the divine will and the best interests of mankind. This morality is taught not by books, but by example and occasional precept. This morality is alike respected by every religion, for it is the dictate of the universal conscience. Each religion may claim to be the true basis of this morality, but the school will have to do with the morality and not the religion.

"The religion should be taught at home and in the church. There it can be rendered specific and detailed. The important doctrines may there be carefully inculcated and a strong religion imparted, when the public school at best could furnish only a very weak religion.

"The churches or synagogues should have their parochial schools, or their equivalents, where the children could go after a two or three years' course at the public schools, and be instructed both in religion and in the higher branches of learning.

"The State has nothing to do with either of these. Normal schools and State colleges should be extinguished. The State has no right to furnish any citizen gratis with the luxuries and remunerative advantages of higher education. It might as well furnish each citizen with a house and farm. Its only defense of State education is State preservation, and the classics and geometry cannot be taught under that plea.

"If the public school had, at farthest, a three years' curriculum, the pupil would have ample time for the parochial school or its equivalent, and the State would be relieved of a great pecuniary burden. In New York City, for example, instead of multiplying our expensive school edifices, we should need only half of what we have.

" The cry of irreligious schools, under this American system, is just as senseless as would be the cry of irreligious reading-rooms or irreligious eating-houses, because no religion was apparent in them. The growth of religion in our country is due to its religious liberty. Injure that religious liberty and you check that growth. And not only do you check the growth of religion, but you engender controversies that infiltrate our politics and prepare the way for the overthrow of all liberties. Religious contests form the fertile soil of tyrannies, and it is for us Americans to avoid carefully the beginnings of a false system that would intensify religious hatreds and strife. While the Government is neutral, all religions can grow according to their own vitality, and the truth will eventually triumph peacefully and satisfactorily to all."

Wayland Hoyt, D.D., quotes from " The Judges of Faith : Christian *vs.* Godless Schools," a work written by a Roman Catholic priest and endorsed by Cardinal Newman and Cardinal Gibbons and six other Roman Catholic bishops and high officials. Dr. Hoyt, after ample citations, adds :

" Certain things are very manifest from this reading of this Roman Catholic book.

" *First.* The chief opposition to our public schools is not from the Roman Catholic laity, but is from the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. That is, at least, indirectly apparent on every page of this publication. If the spirit of the Roman Catholic laity were hostile to our public schools, it would not require such persistent and tremendous fulmination from every quarter as fills these pages. You will find much talk here about the sacred rights of parents as to choice of schools for their children. The simple truth is, the Roman Catholic Hierarchy are interfering all the time and whenever possible with the sacred rights of parents in this regard. They are compelling parents by the threat of excommunication. That, to a Roman Catholic, means much. In a Roman Catholic Catechism of Christian Doctrine, prepared and enjoined by the order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, and published by ecclesiastical authority, I find the following question and answer :

" ' Q. Are all bound to belong to the Church ?

" ' A. All are bound to belong to the Church ; and he who knows the Church to be the true Church and remains out of it cannot be saved.'

" To be denied the Sacraments and so to be thrust out of what they believe to be the true Church is, then, for the Roman Catholic, to be lost eternally. It is this, to Roman Catholic parents, tremendous weapon, the Roman Catholic Hierarchy are wielding against our public schools. The Hierarchy is massing its artillery against the rights of parents, and from the vantage-ground of their capture is making assault upon our common school system. The trouble is mainly and precisely with the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. We should have none of this clash and contest about our public schools were it not for them. A Roman Catholic layman writes in a pamphlet from which I quote :

" ' The parochial school movement did not originate with the Catholic laity ; they were not consulted at its inception ; they have not since been afforded an opportunity to say whether they approved of it or not. From the beginning until to-day the Catholic laity of America have been treated in this important matter on the explicit understanding, on the part of the clergy, that it is a thing about which they are not entitled to have an opinion, except such as are dealt out ready-made to them by the clergy, who claim to be the only competent or rightful judges regarding the education of the laity.'

" Such persistent refusal on the part of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy to consult or care for the wishes of the laity is, to say the least, un-American.

" *Second.* Notice the clear present cue of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy ; it is to sneer at and stigmatize our public schools as ' godless.' Almost wholly for their sakes, because in this free America we would be scrupulously careful of the least trenching on even the shyest rights of conscience, what could in any wise rightfully be called sectarian instruction has been removed from the teaching in our common schools. Very great deference to Roman Catholics has been shown here. But now when what they demanded has been done, when American fair play has been so conspicuously displayed, the Roman Catholic clergy turn with bitter attack upon the entire common school system and stigmatize it ' godless,' that they may depreciate it among their people, and if possible destroy it altogether.

" And the comparative results as to morality between our public schools and Roman Catholic parochial schools may be plainly enough seen from the following statistics gathered by Mr. Dexter A. Hawkins from the census of 1870. It seems, according to these statistics, there are furnished to every ten thousand inhabitants in the United States :

	Illiterates.	*Paupers.*	*Criminals.*
By Public Schools of State of Massachusetts	71	69	11
By Public Schools of 21 States.......	350	170	75
By Roman Catholic Schools	1,400	410	160

"In the State of New York the Roman Catholic parochial school system turns out three and a half times as many paupers as the public school system.

"*Third.* Look at the fact confronting us. On the one side our vast system of common schools, the substruction of our great Republic, dear to our hearts, venerable with our history. On the other hand, thoroughly organized celibate clergy, cut off from every participation in the cares or knowledge or responsibilities of parenthood, receiving primal and chief orders from a foreign, Italian, celibate Pope, setting themselves to damage and, if possible, wreck the very basis on which our civilization and institutions rest. If this is not foreign interference, what can be foreign interference ?

"*Fourth.* Is it not a really momentous question—how far those who accept the teachings of such a hierarchy as is disclosed by these quotations can be much trusted on our school boards and in the management of our public schools ? I cannot help thinking of these most righteous words of Mr. Edwin D. Mead of Boston :

"'Whenever any decision or instruction goes so far as to compel any Roman Catholic father to withdraw his own children from the public schools, when he comes to think it a sin to send them there, or to act as if it were a sin, then surely it will be a sin for him to have a hand in their administration, and his simple manhood will compel him to withdraw from the school board, if he belongs to it, and from the schoolroom, if he be a teacher. The public school must be in the hands of its friends. No man should be tolerated for a day in the administration of the public schools who is not a believer in them.'

"*Fifth.* Consider the veritable and tremendous menace to our institutions which necessarily springs from this attitude of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy to our public schools. A main benefit of our public school system is that in it there is the most thorough mingling of the children of all sorts and classes of our citizens. In these schools and because of this fact the great American lesson of political equality is taught as it can possibly be taught in no other place or way. This lesson is the undermost principle of our Republican civilization. In these public schools more rapidly than in any other place, the children of our immigrant population lay off the features, garb, language of foreigners and become Americanized, become fitted to discharge in after years the duties and functions of American citizens. Now, to gather into parochial schools so great a number of the children of foreign-born parents as is done in these schools so steadily insisted on by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, is to form and foster a great company of future American citizens who have been for their lives long segregated, set apart by themselves, as a special class, denied the breathing of the vigorous air of our American institutions. The danger of such and so numerous and so educated a body of citizens is sufficiently plain to the anxious forecasting of every devoted lover of our free and great Republic."

THE NEWER HISTORY OF THE OLDER WORLD.

BY PROFESSOR HOWARD OSGOOD, D.D.

From *The Sunday-School Times*, Philadelphia, September 20, 1890.

FOR seventy years the monuments of Egypt, and for fifty years the monuments of Babylonia and Assyria, have been studied by a host of scholars, the peers of any others the world has known. M. Menant, of France, says that the texts already discovered would fill five hundred octavo volumes, —a larger amount than all the Greek and Latin classics. In Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Leyden, Upsala, and elsewhere, professorships of Egyptology and Assyriology have been long established. The permanent literature of these subjects, the sober, scientific works of these scholars issued in the past fifty years, would make a library by themselves. Wherever sound philological and historical study is honored, there the names of the great Egyptian and Assyrian scholars will be placed high in the list of those who have benefited their fellows.

On the surface of this great stream of discovery and scientific study there has been some froth and wreckage of wild assertion. Biblical and anti-biblical disputants have found secure vessels for their freight, only to prove them rotten trees. But froth and wreckage merely show the strength of the stream ; they neither make nor direct it. The immense value of this work arises from the well-nigh numberless monuments discovered. These scholars give us the monuments and their story, so that the learner can compare the story with its source. If now we can ascertain the points on which these Egyptian and Assyrian scholars—French, English, German, Dutch, Italian, Swedish, Russian—are unanimously agreed, we may be sure there is good foundation for those points ; and it is also certain that those points will represent the most scientific historical teaching of the present day concerning early man. Beyond the monuments all is, must be, mere speculation. The monuments form the horizon of all extra-biblical knowledge of early man. On the following four points there is unanimous agreement :

1. That with the earliest monuments man appears before us with language fully formed, and elaborate written characters responding to all his needs. Never afterwards in Babylonia or Egypt are the signs of language more beautifully shaped and chiselled than on the numerous diorite statues of Tello, or on the granite and limestone of the tablet of Senoferu, of the pyramids of Unas, Pepi, Mirinri, of the tomb of Ti. The long and many inscriptions of Tello and of the pyramids show us the language capable of expressing all religious thought, rich in the terms of settled, civilized, refined life, abundant in geographical names, and speaking of gold, iron, bronze, and precious woods and minerals, as of common possessions.

2. The earliest monuments show us the religions of Babylonia and Egypt already fully formed ; their main fundamental doctrines remaining the same throughout the existence of their people, though with the centuries there were many changes in non-fundamental points. Up to 1880 there were many attempts to trace the evolution of the religion of Egypt ; but by the opening of the inscribed pyramids in 1881 all historical ground was taken from these speculations,—for these inscriptions display all the main doctrines of the Egyptian religion fully elaborated. So that it is now agreed on all hands by the masters of these sciences that one must go behind all monuments, all historic proof, if he would attempt to trace the beginnings of Egyptian or Babylonian religion.

3. The art of Tello in Babylonia and of the pyramid times in Egypt was the highest art ever reached in these lands ; their earliest art was their best. At this earliest period the numerous extant remains of their art show a mastery of all details, an ease and grace of handling, a simplicity and truth to nature, a refinement of conception, and a deftness in execution never attained again in the later centuries of these peoples. The statues of Tello, the intaglios of early Chaldea, the statues and bas-reliefs of early Egypt, the pyramids, enormous in mass, yet with exquisitely finished, inscribed, painted inner passages and chambers ; the tomb of Ti at Sakkarah, with its wealth of sharp-cut letters, and more abundant bas-reliefs of all the forms of most ancient home life, and many other tombs,—all tell the same story, that man at this era had reached the acme of the art of his people.

4. Language and religion fully formed, and art at its best, prove the fourth point,—that at the earliest age of man, shown by the monuments, a very high degree of civilization reigned in Babylonia and Egypt, and both these lands were intimately acquainted and in commercial exchange with the Sinaitic Peninsula and the Syrian-Phœnician coast. The earliest monument of Egypt is not found in Egypt, but in the Wady Magharah of the Sinaitic Peninsula, whither Senoferu had marched his forces to secure the copper and turquoise mines, and where he erected his tablet to commemorate that fact. The inscriptions on the pyramids are familiar with the products of inner Africa and the Syrian coast. The diorite, tons in weight, for the statues of Tello, as well as gold, etc., the inscriptions reiterate, were brought to the Euphrates from the Sinaitic Peninsula. To accomplish this, only two ways were open : by sea around Arabia,—a voyage of thirty-four hundred miles,—or across a fierce desert of eight hundred miles. These inscriptions are also familiar with the upper lands of the Euphrates and the Phœnician coast and their products. In other words, there was a much earlier and larger international exchange than has hitherto been supposed. And this conclusion from the monuments is corroborated by Virchow's classification of the crania of ancient peoples, which forces from him the conclusion that "archæologically we must attribute greater importance to international exchange in antiquity than we have hitherto."

Now, these points, soberly used, throw vast light upon the early chapters of Genesis, and harmonize completely with the Bible's references to those times. But there is one very singular demur—an application of the argument of silence to this plain story of the monuments. The criticism of the Bible which used to call itself "higher," but now prefers the title of "historical criticism," gives us its history of these early times and men, but either studiously avoids or sneeringly refers to this monumental history and its scholars. "Historical criticism's" history, unfortunately, is not based on monuments; and, still more unfortunately, it is a contradiction of the history by monuments. If the history by monuments of early man is true, the fundamental assumptions of "historical criticism" cannot be true. If "historical criticism" is to justify its name, it is high time it made earnest work with the fast increasing number of the monuments of early man.

Rochester Theological Seminary.

CHRIST'S HUMILIATION.

BY REV. C. H. SPURGEON, MINISTER OF THE METROPOLITAN TABERNACLE, LONDON.

From *The Golden Rule*, Boston, October 2, 1890.

Christ might have been among those who are born in marble halls and robed in purple, but it was not so. You see Him at home at Nazareth, a carpenter's son, obedient to His parents, doing the little errands for the house like any other child. And there He dwelt in poverty with His parents, beginning life as a workman's boy. He veiled His Godhead beneath His childhood. He went up to Jerusalem, and there astonished the doctors by His answers, yet He went home with His parents and was subject to them. Then when He grew up, and the time for His appearing had come, how He humbled Himself! He did not knock at the door of the high priest, nor seek out the rabbis and learned scribes, but He made companions of fishermen from the lake, infinitely His inferiors, even if we regard Him simply as a man. Publicans and sinners drew near to hear Him, and when they gathered round Him, and when little children stood and listened to Him, then He poured out the fulness of His heart, for "He humbled Himself."

This was not the deepest humiliation; He allowed the devil to tempt Him. I have often wondered at this. His pure mind was right loyal; how can He bear contact with the prince of darkness and father of lies? Would Christ allow Satan to put Him to the test? He did; and spotless purity had to bear contact with infamous villainy.

Personally, in His own body, He suffered weakness, hunger, thirst; in His own mind He suffered rebuke, contumely, falsehood. He was constantly the man of sorrows. He was belied, called a glutton and a winebibber, and His miracles were ascribed to the help of Beelzebub.

Notice, now, the rule of His descent. "He humbled Himself, and became obedient." I have known of persons trying to humble themselves by will-worship. I have stood by the side of a monk's bed when he was not in it, and I have seen the whip with which he flagellated himself. That was his way of humbling himself. Our Lord's way of humiliation was by obedience. He invented no strange way of making Himself ridiculous. He put upon Himself no singular garb that would draw attention to His poverty, but simply obeyed His God, and there is no humility like obedience. While here, He was always subservient to the Father's great purpose; He came to do the will of Him that sent Him, and to finish His work. He did the will of God also obediently by following out what He knew to be the Father's great design in sending Him. He was sent to save, and He went about seeking to save that which was lost. When we get into unison with God, when we wish what He wishes, when we live for the great object of God, then we shall be truly humble.

Now what was at the bottom of that abyss to which He descended? It was death. He was obedient to death, even the death of the cross. Our Lord went to the death still obedient. He died willingly, but at the same time He died obediently. He waited until His hour was come, when He was able to say, "It is finished"; then He bowed His head and gave up the ghost. Oh, what a death was His! It was even the death of the cross, which was a violent death and an extremely painful death. He died in pain most exquisite, both of body and of soul. It was also a death most shameful. Thieves were crucified with Him; the death was one for slaves, for the basest of mankind. No Roman citizen might be put to death in such a way as that; it was a mean death. He died not like a hero in battle; He died as a criminal, upon the gallows-tree of Calvary. He humbled Himself even to this.

From all this let us learn to imitate our Lord in His humility, His obedience and His self-denial. Let us hate the sin that brought upon Him this humiliation, and let us be filled with a burning desire to honor Him. Every time He seems to put away the crown, let us put it on His head. Every time we hear Him slandered, let us speak up for Him. "Soldiers of Christ, arise." Proclaim Him King, and boldly say that His word is infallible, and that His precious blood alone can atone for sin.

NEWMAN AND DÖLLINGER CONTRASTED.*

BY RT. REV. A. C. COXE, D.D., BISHOP OF WESTERN NEW YORK.

From *The Churchman* (Episcopalian), New York, September 27, 1890.

THE decease, at an advanced age, of John Henry Newman, once the brilliant vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford, and the delight of Oriel College, closes a period of Anglican history to which I must devote a few words in a spirit of tender regret, but with fidelity to truth. While yet an under-graduate I became acquainted with some of his work, then first attracting attention beyond the little world of his university. He was charged, even then, with unfaithfulness to his position, but so strong were his utterances against Roman corruptions that I gave to the spell of his genius the assent of a disciple, and for a time he dictated his ideas to my confiding thought almost with despotic sway. The movement, of which he was not the author, and which he proved incapable of controlling, derived, nevertheless, a peculiar charm from his fine poetic feeling and from what seemed to me his surpassing piety. For a long time I refused to believe that "Tract No. 90" proceeded from his pen. It was diametrically counter to other statements of doctrine which were confessedly his, and it was tainted with a moral obliquity utterly inconsistent with my conceptions of his exalted character. To "palter, in a double sense," about formulas which one has solemnly accepted in their grammatical force, as expounded by the Common Prayer, and by other contemporary standards (recognized for three centuries as their legitimate interpreters), seemed to me a crime which it was cruel to attribute to so good a man. I resented the idea, as one would resent a charge of perjury brought by momentary caprice against a friend of spotless integrity. When the fact became known I no longer read his words with satisfaction. Could he be intentionally weaving ambiguities to entrap young and ardent admirers into sophistical and dangerous, if not dishonorable, dealings with conscience and with men? I remember the unspeakable anguish with which I turned away from him as a guide, while even then I believed he was only momentarily untrue to his better nature, and would recover himself, like St. Peter.

The astounding news of his final downfall overwhelmed my soul; I writhed in pain almost physical when I learned of it. Had he interposed a sober period of retirement to convince himself and friends that he was weighing the tremendous nature of his revolt against all that had claims upon his love and gratitude—not to speak of what should have been the conduct of an honorable man—one could have wept for him and yet been able to bless him and love him and sympathize with his struggle and its catastrophe. But no! his "Apologia" does not mitigate the nature of his deed; his secession was the betrayal of a trust the most sacred which any man can assume. It broke the hearts of confiding friends, the purest and the best that God could give to a fellow-traveller through this bad world. And worst of all, he wrecked the faith and hopes and the life work of many precious youth who had given him their unsuspecting confidence and who followed him into a quagmire where all that was of promise in their intellect and character has been swallowed up and lost to their age and to the best interests of humanity. The distress and misery with which their ruin clouded the remaining days of fathers and mothers, and broke up families and the happiness of homes, is unutterable. If there be a woe against those "by whom offences come," one trembles to reflect upon the career of Newman.

But, happily, we who know not the infirmities, mental and moral, with which his judgment was distracted and his conduct made fanatically inconsistent, have no right to judge the erring brother; though it is cowardly and untrue to duty if we fail to condemn his deeds. How tenderly the outraged Church of England, how maternally his university, how generously his smitten friends have dealt with their lost companion and beloved brother is known to all. It furnishes an example of forbearance the most unparalleled. Almost to the point of weakness they have practically forgotten everything but the fact that he once was theirs; their "own mother's son." All that made him great was his Anglican life and training; all that lasts of his life-work belongs to his Oxford days. Throw a veil over the rest.

---

* Extract from Bishop Coxe's address to the Council of his diocese, at Niagara Falls, Sept. 16, 1890.

It has been justly said that his peculiar turn of mind enabled him to convince himself of anything. The holy shirt of Treves, the winking Madonna, the liquefaction of the blood at Naples, he could accept as a foregone conclusion and argue up to it with infinite ingenuity. As a barrister he could have taken the most desperate case on his hands and persuaded himself that his client was strong in the justice of his plea. In short, he was the victim of his own plausibility. He nauseated the morality of Liguori and swallowed it. He regretted the new dogmas and subscribed to them. He lamented much that disgraced the Roman Church, but took his seat in the College of Cardinals, where the debauched Antonelli had so long reigned supreme. Pio Nono accepted him as an adherent, but the Jesuits were too cunning to let him be made Cardinal until they had forced the dogma of infallibility upon the Roman obedience. What an enigma his character must remain! God only knows its solution. But a true Catholic may be permitted to class him with Tertullian; to treasure what he gave us of his gold, and to burn his chaff with fire.

We may love him yet, and weep for all that he might have been. But no soldier of the cross who loves the cause of Christ and follows "the noble army of martyrs" with unshaken loyalty to their example can dissemble the fact that if they were faithful to the truth of God, he most assuredly was not.

I know how fashionable it is to confound truth and error by indiscriminate eulogy, when one speaks of individuals whom the world finds it convenient to praise. But, I am a Christian bishop, devoted to Catholic standards of right and wrong, and bound to bear my testimony as to truth, leaving men and motives to the only Judge of all. The Reformation in England preserved our Catholicity, saving us from the innumerable manufactured articles of Roman credulity. To that event the Anglo-Saxon race owes all that distinguishes it from the Latin races in Italy, in Spain, in Portugal, in Mexico, and Brazil. But if the career which I have criticised was true to God, to the Scriptures, to the Creeds, and to the Gospel in its purity, then that Reformation was a curse, and not our blessing and our glory. If Newman was right, then the martyrs of Oxford and Smithfield were criminals, and those who deluged France with the blood of St. Bartholomew's Day were saints of God, and blessed was the Te Deum which the Pope sang in Rome to praise the Most High for a massacre that astounded the world. Mary, the bloody, should have reigned as long as did Elizabeth, and her husband, Don Philip, should have sent the Duke of Alva to England to duplicate the cruelties with which he decimated populations in the Netherlands and horrified mankind. Yes, and the inquisition should have been established in London as it was in Madrid, and the Armada, which God dashed to pieces after the Pope had blessed it, should have been permitted to reduce our forefathers to the abject estate of the populations of nearly all the Latin colonies in America. We should have been at best either a nation of Atheists, like reactionary France, or a population of zealots, crouching to kiss the foot of the Roman Pontiff, and accepting his "Syllabus" as the definite character of humanity to be the slaves of ignorance, the dupes of imposture, and the tools of despotism. In a word, Newman himself owed all that gave him infinite superiority over all his comrades of the Roman curia to that very Reformation which made England and Oxford what they have been ever since. He could never have been the Newman that he once was but for all that he abandoned when he ceased to be the Newman of St. Mary's.

In judging of a life work, then, we are forced to inquire, was it faithful to humanity and to God? In a word, was it a testimony to the sovereignty of truth? If not, the man may have been himself the victim of honest delusions, but his life was a lie.

And all this, while it allows for the sincerity of an errorist, becomes a tribute to those who have suffered through fidelity to right against cruel wrong. This century has seen no nobler spectacle than that of the illustrious Döllinger, the Antipas of Latin Christendom; the acknowledged chieftain of thought and scholarship in Roman schools; the intrepid witness to Catholic orthodoxy against the brazen arrogance of Pio Nono and the "Council of Sacristans," which surrendered the faith of ages to his assumption of infallibility. Honor to the memory of him who, to all threats and to all flatteries and to the menace of eternal damnation, always and to the last of life made answer: "I cannot subscribe to what I know to be untrue." Honor to the Abdiel of the enslaved churches! At this moment the Bishops of Holland, with the Old Catholic Bishops of Germany and Switzerland, are assembled on the banks of the Rhine to take up his testimony and energize it for the regeneration of those churches that composed the "Holy Roman Empire," in which the Emperor and the Pontiff were rival lords. Out of this was created the "Roman Catholic Church,"—a thing unknown to antiquity, and in its present form an establishment more recent than those of Luther and Calvin. The Prayer-Book of the Church of England is older than the creed of the Council of Trent; and when we say in the ancient creed of undivided Christendom that we believe in the "Holy Catholic Church," let us mean what we say, and be "ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh us a reason." All this is what the heroic life and death of Döllinger should make clear to enlightened men. As to the contrasted history of Newman, the best comment is that of St. Vincent of Lerins, speaking of the brilliant and illustrious Tertullian. He argued that when a great teacher and guide falls away, we are to remember that truth is not to be judged of by men, but all men are to be weighed and measured by the unchangeable standard of truth, and truth means no novelty, but what "from the beginning, everywhere, and by all the churches," has been known and held as the Faith once delivered to the saints.

For The Magazine of Christian Literature.

THE "CHURCH SUPPORT" SYMPOSIUM.

[Brief Reasons for Various Theories of Church Support.]

II.

Rented Pews.

BY THE REV. GEORGE R. VAN DE WATER, D.D., RECTOR OF ST. ANDREW'S CHURCH, NEW YORK.

We are not disposed to reason with men who talk about things in the abstract, when we undertake to write on the subject of church support. In the matter of church support, we are unable to legislate on any higher plane than practical efficiency will warrant. I freely admit that the ideal church is one sufficiently endowed to have all of its sittings declared free to worshippers. Very few of our churches have any endowment. For the vast majority of our churches the problem of support is simply this, how best to secure from the regular worshippers a steady income sufficient for all needs. Dismissing, therefore, all theory, discarding all ideals, let us discuss this problem in a common-sense, business-like way.

In my judgment, for an unendowed parish church in a city or a community, where worshippers at the principal services attend in sufficient numbers to fill all the sittings, this support can best be secured by renting the pews. In country places, or in parishes of the city where regular attendants do not fill the church, and where the services are attended by the same people throughout the whole year, the question of renting pews, or making them free, and soliciting subscriptions by envelope, is not a serious one. The results are the same in either case. The same people will occupy the same pews, and the envelope pledge will be an exact substitute for the weekly amount of pew rent. But in churches where, for summer months, a large portion of the congregation is absent, and during winter months the regular congregation fill the pews, the rental of pews will always prove the most satisfactory, and always provide the most regular and plenteous support.

The advantages of pew rents over free churches are these: they enable families to sit together—a great consideration for the children; they insure a steady revenue at a season of the year when parishioners in large numbers are absent; they enable a vestry to forecast with some degree of certainty the probable income, and then wisely to provide for the annual expenses; they relieve the rector from a vast amount of worry, and the people from unusual and constant solicitations; they furnish the opportunity for giving to charities and missions through the offertory.

Fully conceding that if a church is free from debt, and provided with ample endowment for all its expenses, that it would be a selfish thing for such a church to rent its pews, I am prepared to maintain that for a church not free from debt and without other means of support than the offerings of its people, renting pews is in every way desirable, and in no way whatever unchristian.

As between renting a pew for a fixed sum and asking a pledge for a fixed sum there is no difference. As for giving the use of a pew for a consideration and assigning a pew for a consideration there is no difference. My own experience justifies me in saying that there have been no less troubles arising from want of courtesy and reasonable consideration of strangers' rights in a free church, than in one the pews of which are rented.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

CHRISTIAN UNITY AND THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE. By HENRY FORRESTER, New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1889. Pp. 86, 8vo, cloth, $1.00.

This book is an attempt to show how an ecclesiastical unity of the Protestant churches in this country might be accomplished on the basis of the Declaration of the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, put forth in 1886. The scope of that declaration is practically limited to the field of American Protestantism, leaving aside the broader question of union with the Greek and Roman Churches. And yet even within this narrower range the document itself raises an obstacle to unity which seems almost insurmountable. That obstacle appears in the fourth term of communion, the acceptance of the historic episcopate. For this, taken as it stands, means that all non-episcopal churches must acknowledge the invalidity of the ordination of their clergy, and agree to their reordination at the hands of the bishops. How can this obstacle be overcome? It is this question which this book is written to answer. It accordingly endeavors, first of all, to see whether reordination is so essential to church unity as the Episcopalians generally suppose. The writer reviews briefly the acts and canons of the Councils of the Church in the first four centuries, in order to obtain their testimony on the two points of the indelibility of orders and the treatment of the separatists. As to the first point his investigation leads him to conclude that the only indelibility of orders which the Primitive Church recognized was "that a man having once been rightly ordained would never need to be ordained again to the same office. If he should be deposed he lost the power bestowed upon him at his ordination, and if he were restored, he would receive it again without a new ordination." As to the second point, while the action of the Nicene Council with reference to the Novatians is matter of dispute, there is no question as to the action taken by later councils in the cases of the Donatists and other separatists. In all these cases the possession of orders by the separated sects was denied by the Councils, and yet upon restoration to the Church their bishops and clergy were received without reordination. Upon what principle, then, was this course adopted? Not on the principle of indelibility of orders, nor on that of retrospective validity, but on the truer principle of "the plenary authority and power of the Church." It is Christ's spirit which animates the Church and gives her authority and power to do whatever is best suited to advance her mission and work. Whatever the Church as a whole recognizes is for that very reason valid and effectual. The early Church did not regard the *manual act* of the bishop as essential to ordination, although his *authority* was respected as that of the governing member of the Church. Thus the form of ordination was not the essential thing, but the recognition of the ordination by the Church. It is this principle of the authority of the Church which the writer of this book proposes as the key to Protestant unity through the American Episcopal Church. Let that Church exercise *her* authority to do what is best for the cause of Christianity, and so interpret the declaration of her bishops as to receive all fit Protestant ministers without reordination, who will accept her doctrine, discipline and worship. This is asking no more than what she already does in the case of Roman clerics. For, as the writer shows, the consecration of the first Roman bishop for this country was against canon law, and was therefore null and void, and invalidates all orders conferred in that line. Yet Roman clerics are received without reordination, and by their simple reception are given all the powers of the ministry of the Church. And such a reception would do the same for Protestant ministers, notwithstanding their lack of "episcopal ordination." The way would thus be cleared for their union with the Protestant Episcopal Church, who by her simple, inherent authority would solve the whole difficult problem of a united American Christianity.

The book is clearly and interestingly written, and seems to offer the only practical escape from the embarrassing position into which the Declaration of the Bishops has brought the Episcopal Church by professing to concede so much for the sake of unity, and yet conceding really nothing at all. But the traditions of episcopacy are so strongly rooted that it will be long before the bishops and their Church as a whole can be brought to treat non-episcopal churches so generously and unselfishly. We think the book is weak in its assumption of the necessity, desirability, and possibility of organic church unity. Christian unity is undoubtedly all that, but Christian unity and church unity are two very different things. The author, however, deserves commendation for his careful use of historical data, his frank acknowledgment of difficulties, the justice of his conclusions, and his earnest, irenical spirit.

H. RICHARD HARRIS.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

The Poetry of Job. By George H. Gilbert, Ph.D., Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the Chicago Theological Seminary. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 1889. Pp. xiv., 224, $1.

A scholarly young minister, who, however, had unfortunately neglected his Hebrew, once asked us to recommend to him a readable work on the Book of Job, which would dispense with technical exegesis and yet give him a fair understanding of the thought and style of what he had been taught to regard as the world's greatest poem. We did the best we could for him at the time, recommending such monographs as *The Argument of the Book of Job Unfolded*, by Dr. William Henry Green, to be supplemented by such briefer essays as the eighth chapter of *The Spirit of the Hebrew Poetry*, by Isaac Taylor. But we informed him that he had described a real *desideratum* in biblical literature, and that no work then known to us would meet just the need that he felt. If we were asked the same question now, we should reply without hesitation that Professor Gilbert's book answered the purpose exactly. Though based upon thorough study of the original, and utilizing the most recent results of philological research, the book is a popular one throughout, and seems to have been written chiefly for readers of the English Bible. The translation is at once so faithful and striking, and the treatment which follows is so brief and skilful, that the average student of Scripture can gain from it a more adequate conception of "this greatest product of the Hebrew mind" than can be gotten in the same length of time from any other translation or treatise that we have ever seen.

The work is divided into two parts, each occupying about a hundred pages. The first is a rhythmical translation of Job. The Revised Version of this book was a great improvement upon the Common Version, the changes being as numerous and important, perhaps, as in any part of the Old Testament, and one obvious feature of that superiority was its preservation of the Hebrew parallelism. Professor Gilbert's translation, however, preserves not only the parallelism of the original, but also the movement by tones. Most of the Hebrew lines in Job have three tones, the only important exceptions being the occasional two-toned and four-toned lines. In every case the English lines are here made to correspond. For instance, in the familiar passage of 3 : 17, the three-toned lines of the Hebrew are rendered into three-toned English lines, thus:

> "The wicked have ceased there from troubling,
> And there are the weary at rest."

But in no case has he sacrificed the sense to either rhythm or sentiment. Doubtless it is an ungracious task to correct renderings which are endeared by sacred associations to thousands of devout readers, but Professor Gilbert, like the Victorian revisers, promptly parts company with our venerable version whenever it is unintelligible or misleading. There will, of course, be no objection to this in the case of such absurd translations as those of the old version in 26 : 5 and 31 : 35, because they do not state any important general truth. But it is far otherwise with such a passage as 13 : 15, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him," for this, though not a correct rendering of this particular passage, has been a comfort and stay to many a soul when near to death. But Professor Gilbert, following the American Committee and the margin of R. V., renders thus:

> "Behold, he will slay me; I hope not:
> But my ways I will prove to his face."

The only objection to this is the ambiguity of the clause, "I hope not." It may mean, "I hope that he will not slay me," and it will be so taken by most English readers, whereas the meaning that our author wished to convey is just the opposite of this—viz., I do not hope, I have no hope. Some of his renderings are less accurate than those of R. V., but the great majority of them are better than those of either of our current versions; and, on the whole, it is not too much to say that this is the best translation of Job in the English language.

The second part of the book is the Interpretation of the Poem, consisting of five chapters, the first giving a brief analysis of Job, the theme, the characters, and the development of the poem; the remaining four being occupied with comparative criticism, the poet's conceptions of God, and his references to Human Life, Animal Life, and Nature, being compared with those found in Homer, Dante, Shakspere, and Milton. One specimen of the vivid style of his interpretations must suffice, 38 : 12–14:

> "Hast thou ever commanded a morning?
> Hast shown to a dawning its place,
> To lay hold of the corners of earth,
> That thence may be shaken the wicked?
> It [the earth] changes as signet-clay,
> So that things appear as a garment."

"Night spreads a blanket over the earth. Morn comes, and, seizing the corners of this vast blanket, lifts it, and shakes the wicked out of its thick folds. Earth, smitten by the dawn, is transfigured. What but a moment ago was formless clay shows now a clear and divine impress. The mountains and hills and valleys stand forth with sharply cut outlines—the beauteous garment of the earth."

Vigorous and graphic expositions like this occur on every page, and, though not concerned primarily with the religious teachings of the poem, they do unquestionably make its spiritual lessons more effectual by enhancing the beauty and significance of their literary setting. W. W. Moore.

Hampden Sidney, Va.

Christian Theism. By the Rev. C. A. Row, M.A. New York: Thomas Whittaker (1890). Pp. viii., 318, 12mo, cloth, $1.75.

Christian Theism: Its Claims and Sanctions. By D. P. Purinton, LL.D. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Pp. vii., 303, 8vo, $1.75.

Canon Row's work is addressed to plain common sense and not to the professional philosopher. Novelty is not aimed at. The aim is to give a brief and popular exposition of the argument for theism, and to consider the objections which are commonly urged. As such exposition the work is highly to be commended. The presentation is lucid and the temper of the work is perfect. The nature of the evidence is first dwelt upon with the aim of warding off false expectations, and the difficulties arising from agnosticism are briefly considered. The argument then takes the familiar road. The argument from causation and from adaptation is presented, and the bearing of evolution upon the argument from adaptation is discussed. These arguments are then illustrated at length in a very simple and striking way. In this field the author has much of the vividness and force of Paley. The argument is next carried into the moral field, and the theistic and anti-theistic positions are compared in their bearing on life and character. Various popular objections are also considered, chiefly drawn from dysteleology and the facts of physical and moral evil. Of course the author does not remove the difficulty, but he shows clearly that the matter has been rhetorically exaggerated. When the problem is reduced to its lowest terms there is still much mystery remaining, but we are worse off if, declining the theistic position, we have recourse to atheism. Then all is opaque and unintelligible, and the hope for a better solution, which is rational in theism, vanishes into despair. The work closes with a survey of the argument for life after death.

In a work like this the author is not to be judged too critically. A profounder metaphysics would confuse and mislead; and we may well believe that for another audience many things would be differently put. A single criticism, however, seems in place. In the argument from adaptation the alternative is too exclusively represented as a doctrine of chance. This is probably the case with popular atheism, but it is not true of the atheism which has sprung up in connection with scientific speculation. The notion of law which has taken possession of modern thought vacates all appeals to chance, and compels us to view every event as the necessary outcome of the system, so that whoever could have read the system at any point in its history would have seen every present event as potentially present, to the exclusion of all other possibilities. This fact disposes of all atheisms based on chance and time; for, given the system and its laws, all its products to the remotest future are also given. But the same fact disposes of the theistic argument based on probabilities. There never was a system of trial and rejection or a blind and aimless shuffling which by good luck hit upon something which looked like intelligence. If there are any ends in the system, they are essential in the system. No necessary system can mount above itself or make new and groundless departures. Hence atheism must seek to rest in the system itself as a self-enclosed and self-executing necessity; and theism, on the other hand, must seek to show that the system is second and not first, derived and not ultimate. Arguments from natural selection and that sort of thing are hopelessly irrelevant as aids to unfaith.

Dr. Purinton's work is a more ambitious production than that of Canon Row. There is an appearance of careful analysis. The subject is treated under many more heads than appear in the canon's work. Rigorous argumentative forms are often introduced. There is also a disquisition upon the intuitions in addition to all the marks of wide reading. And yet the canon's book seems the more satisfactory. The canon does not "strive nor cry," while a certain agonistic air is manifest throughout the doctor's treatise. The author's abundance of words also leaves us a little in doubt at times as to his exact thought. This is well illustrated in the following titles of chapters: Intelligence in Nature; or, the Eutaxiological Argument; Volition in Nature; or, the Teleological Argument; The Personality of God; or, the Intuitive Argument; The Goodness of God; or, the Historical Argument; The Unity of God; or, the Monistic Argument, and Infinity of God; or, the Causal Argument. One would hardly gather from the titles that the first chapter treats of order in nature, and that the second treats of design. But design is certainly as clear a mark of intelligence as order is; and if volition have anything to do with nature, it must as certainly be displayed in the laws of nature, which are all contingent so far as we know, as in the details of design. Choice in Nature would come nearer the idea intended. Again in the Personality of God, or the Intuitive Argument, it is hard to see how the argument for the divine personality is any more intuitive than the argument, say, for divine causality. If the argument is from intuitions, both alike are intuitive. If the argument is for intuitions, there is no need of argument; for intuitions stand in their own right. The author opens this chapter with a discussion of the nature of intuitions which seems to stand in no vital relation to the rest of it. The result is thus expressed: "We have found within us the self-evident, necessary, and universal conviction of an original, superhuman, personal spirit without us. This spirit, of course, is recognized as self-conscious and free." This conclusion is certainly not warranted by the preceding discussion, and it certainly is not recognized by the mass of theistic writers. Indeed, why argue through 300 pages for the existence of God when we "have within us the self-evident, necessary, and universal conviction of an original, superhuman, personal spirit without us"? In like manner the title, the Goodness of God; or, the Historical Argument, seems to suggest that the goodness of God is confined to history. The Infinity of God; or, the Causal Argument, is equally confusing. In spite of elaborate analysis and of great apparent thoroughness, the author seems not to have had a really clear conception of the essential argument and of the mutual relations of its several forms. But works on theism are valuable less for the speculative adequacy and logical cogency of the argument than for the illustration of the theistic faith already possessed, and for the removal of the crude objections to that faith which abound in superficial thinking. In this respect the work in hand is valuable. We will only add that it must have been a slip of the pen which put Aristotle and Spinoza (p. 92) among the believers in chance.

BORDEN P. BOWNE.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY.

WILLIAM AUGUSTUS MUHLENBERG. By WILLIAM WILBERFORCE NEWTON, D.D. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Pp. 267, 16mo, cloth, $1.25.

This book resembles the sermon of the man who put everything he knew into it for fear that he should leave something out. The attempt is made to tell the story of the career and mission of Dr. Muhlenberg within 267 pages, and still give the writer the chance to disport himself hither and thither like a colt in a ten-acre lot. The book has great promise as one opens it and begins to read, and it has some very fine qualities, but one goes through it with a growing sense of dissatisfaction, and closes it with the regret that Dr. Newton had not put a severer check upon his frolicsomeness, and told us what Dr. Muhlenberg really was and what he did, rather than given us a series of dissolving views concerning him. This great man was second to almost no other of the leading men in the Episcopal Church who have now passed away. He ranks with Bishop White, Bishop Hobart, Bishop Doane, Bishop Alonzo Potter, and the late Dr. De Koven, as one of the men who had insight and outreaching purpose, and who saw in the Episcopal Church something beyond the ecclesiastical partisanship which has been too commonly employed in exercising its functions. Each one of these men did a great and an organizing work, but Dr. Muhlenberg did something more. He moved in advance of others. He anticipated what was coming. He saw how his own communion could be developed upon broad and catholic lines, and the two qualities of insight and breadth were notably conspicuous in all that he said or did. He was a great educator. He led the Church in the movement for parish development. He sounded the depths of the whole question of Christian unity in America in the memorial which he sent to the House of Bishops in 1853, and he was among the first to build up within the Episcopal communion the social and philanthropic institutions which have given this Church favor in the eyes of all men. It is in mapping out and presenting to the public anew these great and distinctive features of Dr. Muhlenberg's life-work that Dr. Newton has made his monograph successful and valuable. It is in the working out of details and in the introduction of irrelevant matter that he chiefly fails to meet our expectations. Into these deficiencies it is not worth while, however, to enter, because we cannot change or improve them. The book itself contains nearly all that one needs to know about this prophetic man, and its material is so well arranged that one can easily comprehend the qualities which made him strong and great. Dr. Newton had some wonderfully good material to work up in this biography. Miss Annie Ayres has written the biography of Dr. Muhlenberg in full, but she did the work from a woman's point of view. She laid little or no emphasis upon the points in which he manifested true leadership. She presented the facts, but had not the literary skill to touch them with the right sort of emphasis. Dr. Newton has performed just this service, and this will give his book a reading where the other volume will be unnoticed. It is on this account that we regret all the more the inaccuracies and the errors of taste which disfigure his production. Dr. Newton has brought out with some distinctness the present bearing of the Memorial Movement initiated by Dr. Muhlenberg upon the present life of the Episcopal Church, but he gives us only enough knowledge of it to create the thirst for more. The whole work and influence of Dr. Muhlenberg allows of a larger, more comprehensive, and more spiritual treatment than Dr. Newton has attempted, and the interest in him both within and without the Episcopal Church will yet compel the writing of his biography by a more competent person than any who have yet attempted it. He was one of the few men who have the prophetic instinct in any age, and are able to inspire their fellow-men with the truths which they most need. The part which Bishop Alonzo Potter and Bishop George Burgess had in the Memorial Movement was hardly less important than that which was played by Dr. Muhlenberg himself, and the leaving out of these two prelates from the story of this effort to reach a larger life is almost like telling the story of "Hamlet" and forgetting to assign his friend Horatio a place in it. One is glad to recognize what is good in this monograph, but it is impossible to do so without the constant feeling that the treatment comes short of what the subject demands. JULIUS H. WARD.

BOSTON, MASS.

THE HISTORICAL CHRIST, THE MORAL POWER OF HISTORY. The Bedell Lectures for 1889. By Rev. DAVID H. GREER, D.D., rector of St. Bartholomew's Church, New York. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1890. Pp. 94, $1.

This is a small book on a big subject. It consists of two lectures, one on the "Historical Christ" and the other on "Christ the Moral Power of History," the second growing naturally out of the first; delivered on the Bedell foundation before the institutions at Gambier, O. It is not pretended that there is anything new either in the subject-matter or in the arguments used to illustrate and enforce it. The ground has been traversed over and over again. Not to speak of the scores of recent lives of Christ, from Paulus to Edersheim, the particular phase of the subject presented in these lectures has received frequent and in some cases masterly treatment. In his recorded conversations with Montholon, Napoleon is reported to have said, *inter alia*, "Between Him [Christ] and anything of this world there is no possible term of comparison." Then, not to go beyond our own language and country, we have that inimitable tenth chapter of Dr. Bushnell's *Nature and the Supernatural*, entitled "The Character of Jesus Forbids His Possible Classification with Men;" Dr. J. W. Alexander's admirable lecture before the University of Virginia on "The Character of Jesus Christ an Argument for the Divine Origin of Christianity," and Dr. Schaff's interesting volume on *The Person of Christ*. The subject of the second of Dr. Greer's lectures has been treated, among others in this country, by Dr. N. L. Rice in Lecture XV. of the University of Virginia course, "On the Moral Effects of Christianity;" by C. L. Brace, in his *Gesta Christi*, and still more recently by Dr. R. S. Storrs in his massive and elegant volume on *The Divine Origin of Christianity Indicated by Its Historical Effects*. We have no room to mention here even the names of British and Continental writers, especially German, on the same great subject.

From this brief survey it will be seen that it required no inconsiderable courage and confidence in himself for a lecturer to venture upon ground thus occupied. But Dr. Greer seems to have been equal to the task he imposed upon himself. Without setting up any claim to novelty or new discoveries, he is fresh, interesting, and original in the only sense in which originality is possible on such a theme. He makes his own independent use of his materials in a style at once free, natural, and elegant, and with a warmth of feeling which must have made his lectures interesting and profitable to the students at Gambier, for whom they were specially prepared.

The gist of the argument in the first lecture is briefly this: The character of Jesus Christ as portrayed in the Gospels is a *fact*. Whatever theory men may advocate or adopt concerning it, its existence as a fact remains; there it stands; it can be neither evaded nor denied. How can it be accounted for? Pilate's question, "What shall I do with Jesus which is called Christ?" is still before the world. The author, who shows a wide acquaintance with the literature of the subject, both ancient and modern, disposes of the mythical theory of Strauss, the legendary theory of Renan, and the theory of a personification of an artistic or poetical ideal, which has had some recent advocates, especially in Germany, as all of them equally unsatisfactory and untenable. The simplest and easiest, and in fact the only possible solution of the problem, is the truth of the narrative in the Gospels, and the actual historical character of the Christ. This explains all, and when admitted it is at once seen that most of the difficulties are of men's own making.

In the second lecture the author shows that Christ Himself is the dominant factor in human history. Other elements enter, but they are secondary and subordinate. For nearly nineteen centuries "the righteousness of Christ has energized history, producing revolutions and working out evolutions like nothing else which history discloses." In spite of imperfections and drawbacks occasioned by our sinful humanity, the Christ of history has been and is the Moral Power pervading and leavening the world's progress. Jesus Christ and Him crucified is "the old, old story," ever new. No other question is so irresistibly attractive even to the world's best minds as the ancient query, "What think ye of Christ?" The world can never hear enough of Him. Men want salvation, and the Gospel of the Son of God is still, and ever will be, the wisdom of God and the power of God unto the salvation of every one that believeth.

We had marked a number of passages for quotation, as specimens of the author's happy way of putting things, but our limits forbid us that pleasure. We cannot in honesty forbear to mention the only passage in the book to which we take exception. On page 57 the author says: "The primitive man, as far as we know anything about him at all, albeit an innocent, was a very ignoble creature, and is so represented in the Bible, sensuous and superstitious, with but little enlightenment and power of self-control, making a fetich out of a serpent and yielding at once to the simplest form of temptation addressed to his bodily appetites." This, we submit, is not the kind of man Adam was, as described in the Bible, and he is about the only "primitive man" we know anything about. According to the Bible he was not an "ignoble," semi-brutal savage, "sensual and superstitious," but a full-grown man, perfect of his kind, created in the image of God. If that is not the true account of the origin of man, who then can tell us anything about it?

With this single exception we commend this little book as an interesting and eloquent presentation of one phase of the great argument for the truth of Christianity.

William Alexander.

San Francisco, Cal.

The Church in thy House. Daily Family Prayers for Morning and Evening. By Rev. Rufus W. Clark, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Detroit. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1890. Pp. 120, 12mo, cloth, 60 cents.

This is a liturgy for the home. It includes Scripture selections and prayers for the morning and evening worship for four weeks. The Scripture readings are given in full for the first four weeks, and then in the idea that the prayers will be repeated. Other Scripture selections are referred to by chapter and verse for three more months. A few special prayers are given at the close of the volume.

Few will deny that a liturgy is generally more needed for the home than it is for the church. There are in every congregation many households which are without daily family worship because the head of the house cannot bring himself to lead in such a service. For such cases a book of this kind may be just what is needed to relieve the difficulty. With such a book a faithful pastor may secure the establishment of family worship in many a home where otherwise there would be no such service. The need of such a book has long been felt, and a number of volumes have been published to meet this need. Some of these volumes are too elaborate and too costly to become generally useful. "The Church in Thy House" is a small book and inexpensive. The prayers are simple, fresh, comprehensive, and spiritual. We have noticed only a few expressions to which we take exception. On p. 6, "Make us know those sins that are displeasing to thee," seems to imply that there may be some sins which are not displeasing to God. On p. 8, "Thou hast been our Creator," is a common mistake of tense; the past tense being wrongly used where the perpetual present is required; it should be, "Thou *art* our Creator." On p. 41. "The day is gone; we give thanks, O Lord," raises the question whether we are to give thanks for the flight of time. But these are small defects, and from such the book as a whole is singularly free. If it should be the means of establishing family worship in many households this modest volume will accomplish a great purpose.

Thomas S. Hastings.

New York

Yale Lectures on Preaching and Other Writings. By Nathaniel J. Burton, D.D., Pastor of the Park Church, Hartford, Conn. Edited by Richard E. Burton. New York: Charles L. Webster & Co.; London: Chatto & Windus. 8vo, cloth, $3.75; to ministers, $3.

From the preface we learn that the lectures on preaching, which occupy the larger part of this volume, and of which there are twenty, were delivered at the Yale Theological Seminary, twelve of them in the Lyman Beecher course of 1884, and the remainder as special lectures in the years 1885 and 1886. Before the lectures there are given to us the addresses delivered at the funeral of Dr. Burton, at the Park Church, October 17th, 1887. These are by President Dwight, Dr. J. H. Twichell, and Dr. E. P. Parker. These addresses give us a high estimate of the mind and of the spirit of Dr. Burton. Evidently he was a man of deep convictions, of generous spirit, of warm affections, and of high courage. President Dwight says: "The richness of his thinking, the tenderness of his feeling, the kindliness of his spirit toward all around him, the earnestness of his working for the good of men, have all been more and more infused with the influence of a living faith in the Divine Master who long since called him into His service and His spiritual kingdom." From these funeral addresses one is prepared to expect much of freshness and vigor in the lectures, and we are by no means disappointed. These twenty lectures cover a great deal of ground both in homiletics and in pastoral theology, but they are quite unique and unconventional. There is nothing here like an attempt to present an orderly system, such as we find in the many books on homiletics. Yet these lectures are full of suggestions and practical hints, fresh and striking, and given always in a singularly forcible way, and in a style that reminds one of the free and bold rhetoric with which Dr. Bushnell expressed his thoughts. We had not the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with Dr. Burton, or of having seen or heard him. But we feel after reading these lectures that we have been communing in a very personal way with a man of rare gifts, bold and brilliant and manly. He has a way of putting things which is often very striking. He asserts his liberty to think for himself and to speak out his thought in his own way, impressing one with the strength of his individuality. He has small patience with any pretension or sham. Evidently he has no great respect for any rules of homiletics which might cramp manly liberty in methods of preaching. The lectures are singularly free from the traditional and the conventional, and therefore they are all the more suggestive and stimulating. We could not recommend these lectures as a text-book for a theological seminary, but we can recommend theological students to read them. More manliness in the ministry the times are needing, and we have rarely met with any book on homiletics, in a wide reading in this department, so well calculated as this to promote the highest Christian manliness.

The lectures are followed by eight addresses and these by nine sermons, which are fresh and striking in thought and in style, and which have been published without the author's revision. We are attracted and moved by the originality and force which we see in these productions, and are quite willing to overlook some infelicities of style in our enjoyment of the manly and devout spirit which speaks to us so directly and so personally that we seem to have been conversing with the author. THOMAS S. HASTINGS.

NEW YORK.

CHRISTIAN UNITY. Being the appendix to "Studies in Hegel's Philosophy of Religion." By J. MACBRIDE STERRETT, D.D., Professor of Ethics and Apologetics in the Seabury Divinity School. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

This appendix having been issued separately, in pamphlet form, we propose to notice it upon its own merits, reserving for another notice the very timely and useful work to which it is added. For, indeed, the connection between the two is not immediately obvious. It consists, for the most part, in carrying the *method* which prevails in the larger work into the consideration of the superadded topic. It is contended that the question of what is essential to the being of the Christian Church should not be considered as an abstract one, or depend merely upon an exegetical inquiry; but upon this last as interpreted by its history—and this its entire history. For, as this has been a progression and a development, and the Christian Institution has not been a mere Procrustean bed, into which all manner of concrete situations were to be thrust, but a living thing, of marvellous flexibility and varied and exhaustless resources, the whole career of it should be studied in order to separate what is essential and unchangeable from what is adventitious and capable of change.

This appendix is a most vigorous piece of polemic writing, and one cannot help admiring its sustained strength and ample resources of expression, as notable merits apart from the thought which is conveyed. And it is a very strong plea for the view which the author maintains. He holds up to some degree of scorn the view against which his polemic is directed. No doubt, this, too, has been advocated in an intemperate spirit and presuming manner, and Dr. Sterrett may have felt that he had a perfect right to give a "Roland for an Oliver." But invective is a weapon which wounds rather than slays. In this kind of writing it seldom happens that full justice is done to the argument and position of the adversary. A clear, calm, temperate presentation of the view to be contested, bringing out its full strength and plausibility, by a critique equally calm and temperate—this is the highest kind of controversial writing, and likely to be most convincing and permanent in its result.

The hints or suggestions in this pamphlet as to the best things that can be immediately done to bring about Christian unity do not claim to be exhaustive or even deeply meditated, but are hazarded to take, with others, their chance. There is need here for Christian patience, but the longing will, some day, find its supply.

Dr. Sterrett has been faulted for his motto, "*Ubi Spiritus, ibi Ecclesia*," and with some degree of justice. But a similar faulting might be made of the correlative, upon which others lay the emphasis, "*Ubi Ecclesia, ibi Spiritus*," and upon the same grounds. Neither statement nor arm of the dilemma is exhaustive, or should be considered separately; and even the whole is by no means a complete and satisfying definition, and confuses rather than clarifies thought.

If by "*Spiritus*" is meant anything that can be determined and taken as evidence of the "*Ecclesia*," it must mean the unique manifestation of the Holy Spirit's influence, as shown in the peculiar graces of the Christian character. And, if so, it is manifest that these show themselves in various ways and in variant degrees among all the different bodies calling themselves Christian. And, indeed, it would require an analysis more successful than any one has succeeded yet in making, to separate these by a clear line of distinction from similar virtues in the outlying world. Thus, then, no accurate meaning can be given to this word "*Spiritus*," occurring in this connection, and the inference would be quite legitimate that any manifestation of righteousness, of strict moral obedience and self-sacrifice would be evidence that then and there existed the "*Ecclesia*." But this would be begging the question, and ignores the signification of the word; which others hold to mean, and which undoubtedly first meant, a providential selection from the whole of mankind to constitute an Institution, which, because of its Divine origin, *must* have its essential and visible marks, and to which special promises were made and unique gifts imparted.

But if, on other grounds, argumentative and historical, or merely assertive, one has convinced himself that such an Institution exists—and if, aside from the criticism which such a claim admits of, he asserts that the "*Spiritus*" or the peculiar graces resulting from the Divine influence are there and nowhere else, it is a claim that can be validated by no evidence that, at this period of the world's life, is convincing.

If, *ex hypothese*, there be an Institution on the earth having all the essential marks, and having existed in unbroken continuity; and if there be, besides, existing other bodies ecclesiastical wanting in some of these particulars, and thus further from the ideal perfection, then an analysis would be required to furnish evidence that the "*Spiritus*" was present in greater degree and with completer harmony in the result of his activity in the former than in the others. If this could be done, it would be a very fine piece of work. It would consist in taking up the best results of each system, in its most saintly individuals, and comparing them as to the entire religious character. It might be found that the one was internally harmonious, as the others were not, notwithstanding that single virtues or graces might be exhibited in the highest degree. But the time is not yet for such a comparison, even though it were possible for the adherent of any system to make it with entire dispassionateness.

The questions as to the origin of the Christian ministry, its ideal constitution, and its mode of transmission, are not so easily solved as the advocates of rival replies imagine, seeing that they do not convince each other. The view which Dr. Sterrett presents and the one he combats have each their strength and plausibility. A *via media* may be possible which shall recognize the element of truth in each, and relate them properly to each other. The mists which are roused by intemperate controversy obscure the Divine light, which will one day shine down and make this *way* visible.

In considering all these questions enough use has not been made of the category of *final cause.*

If the result aimed at, in the Divine interference, is the creation of the holy character, in the purity and the might of the loving, sacrificing spirit, and the result for such an one of his individual perfection and salvation, then incontestibly this result is reached in any and all the Christian bodies; and there is no higher evidence possible that here has been busy the Holy Spirit.

But if, on the other hand, the result aimed at by the Institution of the Christian Church is something more than this; if it claims to possess a system of means and appliances—sacraments and channels of grace—to produce rapid and symmetrical development of the holy character, then its claim, however denied or doubted, demands examination; and if found true, will be ultimately vindicated by its own success.

And if, besides, the aim of the Christian Church is to war with the principle of evil, and gather adherents till it evangelize the world; if it is, or contains a leaven to affect the whole of human society and human welfare, then it is essential to its full success in these particulars that it shall be at unity with itself. Otherwise it is not the aggressive force which can work with full power upon whatever is objected to it. Its strength is dissipated. It is not the perfect channel through which the Holy Spirit can work most powerfully. The mystical influence, and the providential scheme are not in entire agreement.

The question arises whether the "Unity" demanded is to be superimposed from without, and as a consequent of confident assertions, or whether it is to spring up from within, and be the result of a final, free, easy, willing and glad acquiescence; in other words, whether the system, ideally and actually complete already, is to produce the general diffusion of the perfected Christian character; or whether the diffusion and intensity of the loving spirit is ultimately to clarify its own vision, heal all the wounds, slough off the excrescences, cause healthy growth, and thus perfect the system, which in turn will react upon it, and hasten the speed of its work, and the final consummation.

J. STEINFORT KEDNEY.

FARIBAULT, MINN.

NEW POINTS TO OLD TEXTS. By JAMES MORRIS WHITON. Ph.D. New York Thomas Whittaker, 1890. Pp. 255, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Mr. Whiton publishes in this volume the third series of his "Summer Sermons in England," the present series having been preached at various places—Glasgow, Edinburgh, and London—between August 4th and September 8th, 1889. There are twelve in the series, and they are arranged in the order of their delivery. The hope of the author is that in their printed form they may be "helpful to those who are thinking upon the problems of life and studying the current questions of Christian thought." The range of subjects is quite varied, and the spirit of the writer broad and catholic. As a general thing the style is plain and direct, though occasionally there are passages which require to be read a second time, and which must have fallen heavy on the listening ear.

Occasionally the tone is rather hasty and the characterization of the views of others severe. Some may take earnest and honest exception to some of his implications. Lack of agreement as to definitions will account for some of his tilts at the "Pharisees." In the sermon entitled "Better than a Book Religion" (p. 36), we find the following: "That the Bible is inspired no man can doubt whose conscience has felt its moral power, for the quickening of moral and spiritual life. That the Bible is infallible, there is not a particle of evidence beyond the assertion of men who imagine that it ought to be, and whose assertion, when sifted, means only that their interpretation of it is infallible. The more you assert the infallibility of the book, the more you perpetuate the divisions of the sects, each coveting that supreme authority for its own views, the more irreconcilably the more they are persuaded of the infallibility of the Bible as they understand it."

Evidently we have here two conceptions of inspiration, one of which is more explicit and inclusive than the other, and at the same time capable of exacter definition. The author merely denounces those who hold it with all its implications, but does not undertake the more difficult task of formulating a substitute and advocating its adoption in his own specific terms.

C. R. GILLETT.

NEW YORK.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Allard, Paul. La Persecution de Dioclétien et le triomphe de l'Église. Paris: Lecoffre, 1889. 2 vols., pp. xlviii., 459,442, 8vo.

Amélineau, E. Les actes des martyrs de l'Église copte, étude critique. Bangé: Daloux, 1890. Pp. 319, 8vo.

Anspach, J. M., Rev., A. M. Divine Rod and Staff in the Valley of the Shadow of Death; or, Consoling Thoughts for the Dying and Bereaved. New York and London: Funk, 1890. Pp. xvi., 281, 12mo, cloth, $1.

Atkins, F. A. Moral Muscle, and How to Use It. New York and Chicago: Revell. Pp. 96, 16mo, cloth, 50 cts.

Bacuez, L. Das heilige Messopfer und der Priester. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1890. Pp. viii., 399, 8vo, 3.50 mk.

Barges, J. J. L. Notice sur quelques autels chrétiens du moyen âge, avec description des lieux où ils ont été découverts. Paris: Goupy, 1890. Pp. 119, 8vo.

Bassett, Jas., Rev. Persia: Eastern Mission. A Narrative of the Founding and Fortunes of the Eastern Persia Mission; with a Sketch of the Versions of the Bible in the Persian and Persian-Turkish Languages. Philadelphia: Presb. Bd. of Publ., 1890. Pp. ii., 353, 16mo, cloth, $1 25.

Belleli, Lazare. Deux versions peu connues du Pentateuque faites à Constantinople au xvie. siècle. Versailles: Cerf, 1890. Pp. 16, 8vo.

Berthe, A., B.D. Essai sur la vie monastique. Montauban: Granié, 1890. Pp. 86, 8vo.

Bodley, J. E. C. Roman Catholicism in America: (also) The Catholic Democracy in America. Baltimore: Murphy, 1890. Pp. i., 77, 8vo, paper, 25 cts.

Brawley. E. M., D.D. The Negro Baptist Pulpit: A Collection of Sermons and Papers on Baptist Doctrine and Missionary and Educational Work, by Colored Baptist Ministers. Philadelphia: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. 300, 12mo, cloth, $1 25.

Böhringer, Adolf, Dr. Kant's Erkenntnis-theoretischen Idealismus. Leipzig: Fock, 1890. Pp. 86, 4to, 1.50 mk.

Browne, R. D. Plain Sermons on the Fundamental Truths of the Catholic Church. London: Burns, 1890. Pp. 467, 8vo, 6s.

Brugsch, Heinrich. Religion und Mythologie der alten Aegypter. Nach den Denkmälern bearbeitet. Namen Register. Leipzig: Hinrichs', 1890. Pp. 759, 772, 8vo, 50 pf. (Complete with Register, 16.50 mk.)

Brunnhofer, Herm. Giordano Bruno's Lehre vom Kleinsten als die Quelle der prästabilirten Harmonie von Leibnitz. Leipzig: Rauert, 1890. Pp. 63, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Butterworth, Hezekiah. A. M. The Story of the Tunes for Home Reading, Praise Meetings, and Lectures on Sacred Music. Illustrated with anecdotes. New York : Am. Tr. Soc., 1890. Pp. 257, 12mo, cloth, $1.75.

Canniegieter, T. De bevoegdheid tot regeling van het beheer van de Kerkelÿke goederen der hervormde gemeenten berust bÿ de algemeene Synode. Utrecht, 1890. Pp. iv., 219, 8vo, 5 mk.

Cargin, James, Rev. Ritualism, Romanism, and the New Testament. Londonderry: Bib. Soc., 1890. Pp. iv., 188, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Carr, W. G. Scriptural Outlines by Books and Themes. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 162, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Cavanagh, Pius, Father (ed.). The Life of St. Thomas Aquinas, the Angelic Doctor. London: Burns, 1890. Pp. vi., 254, 8vo, 4s. 6d.

Churton, Edward T., Rev. The Missionary's Foundation of Doctrine, with Practical Reflections. London: Masters, 1890. Pp. xx., 344, 8vo, 5s.

Coconnier, Marie-Thomas. L'Ame humaine. Existence et Nature. Poitiers: Blais, 1890. Pp. viii., 499, 16mo.

Cowley, E., Rev., D.D. The Writers of Genesis and Related Topics, Illustrating Divine Revelation. New York: Th. Whittaker, 1890. Pp. 184, 12 mo, $1.

Dalman, Gustav H., Dr. Jesaia liii. Das Prophetenwort vom Sühnleiden des Heilsmittlers mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der synagogalen Litteratur erläutert. (Nr. 25 of Schriften des Institutum judaicum zu Leipzig.) Leipzig: —— 1890. Pp. 60, 8vo. (New York, 40 cts.)

Dana, James D., LL.D. The Genesis of the Heavens and the Earth and all the Host of Them. Hartford, Conn.: The Student Pub. Co., 1890. Pp. 70, 12mo, 60 cts.

Delarc, O. Saint Gregoire VII. et la réforme de l'Église au xie. Siecle. Tome 1er. Abbeville: Retaux,1890. Pp. 534, 8vo.

Denominational (The) Reason Why: Giving the Origin, History, and Tenets of the Christian Sects, with the Reasons Assigned by Themselves for their Specialties of Faith and Forms of Worship. Rev. and enl. London: Houlston, 1890. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Doctrine Chrétienne, Vérité catholique. Preuves et objections; par l'abbé P. S. Citeaux: Saint Joseph, 1890. Pp. 180, 12mo.

Douglas, Hester. The Land where Jesus Christ Lived. London: Nelson, 1890. Pp. 304, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Drexler, Wilhelm. Der Cultus der ägyptischen Gottheiten in den Donau-ländern. Leipzig: Teubner, 1890. 8vo, 4.40 mk.

Drummond, H. The Perfected Life: The Greatest Need of the World. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 32, 16 mo, paper, 20 cts.

Drummond, H. Love, the Supreme Gift: The Greatest Thing in the World. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 32, 16mo, paper, 20 cts.

Du Cauge, Carolo du Fresne, Domino. Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ infimæ græcitatis. Effigies recens, cum vetere editione anni 1688 prorsus congruens Anastat.-Neudruck in 10 Fasc. Fasc I. Breslau, 1890. Pp. 218, fo. (New York, $3.70.)

Eberle, Karl, Dr. Der Tricenarius des heiligen Gregorius. Eine Abhandlung über den kirchlichen Gebrauch der Gregoriusmessen. Regensburg: Pustet, 1890. Pp. 103, 8vo, 1 mk.

Eichhorn, Karl. Akten zur neuesten Kirchengeschichte. (Von R. Rocholl.) Leipzig: Naumann, 1890. Pp. iii., 39, 8vo, 75 pf.

Estienne d'Orviers, la comtesse d'Sainte Thérese. Paris: Didot, 1890. 8vo, 7.50 fr.

Eyton, R. The Apostles' Creed. Sermons. London: Paul, 1890. Pp. 194, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Fillion, L. Cl. La Sainte Bible (texte latin et traduction française), commentée d'aprés la Vulgate et les textes originaux, à l'usage des séminaires et du clergé. Tom 2. Tours: Mame, 1890. Pp. 712, à 2 col., 8vo.

Fillion, L. Cl., et **Nicole,** H. Atlas géographique de la Bible, d'après les documents anciens et les meilleures sources françaises, anglaises et allemandes contemporaines. Paris et Lyon: Delhomme, 1890. Pp. vi., 62, à 2 col , 4to.

Finger Testament. The New Testament. Translated out of the Original Greek. Oxford: Clarendon Press. New York: Nelsons, 1890. 96mo, cloth.

Foster, R. V., D.D. Old Testament Studies: An Outline of Old Testament Theology. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 370, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Fugger, Raimund Lngwig, Graf. Ludwig d'Orleans, Bischof von Amiens. Ein Lebensbild aus dem 18. Jahrhundert. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1890. Pp. viii., 103, 8vo, 1 mk.

Gallagher, Mason, Rev. The True Historic Episcopate as seen in the Original Constitution of the Church of Alexandria, with Introduction by J. McDowell Leavitt, D.D. New York: Funk, 1890. Pp. xxxvi., 312, 12mo, cloth, $1.

Gardiner. Frederic. Aids to Scripture Study. Boston and New York: Houghton, 1890. Pp. ix., 284, 12mo, $1.25.

Gerlach, Mart. v. Der Mensch im Stande der Schuld nach dem Buch Jesaja. Exegetisch herausgestellt und zusammenfassend dargelegt. Leipzig: Faber, 1890. Pp. vii., 171, 8vo, 3.60 mk.

Glazebrook, M. G. Lessons from the Old Testament. Senior Course. Vol. 1: The Creation to the Death of Saul. London: Percival, 1890. Pp. 348, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Gordon, Henry Francis. The Great Pyramid in, but not of, Egypt: Its Claims to be for a Sign, and for a Witness unto the Lord of Hosts in the Land of Egypt, as Announced in the Scriptures of His Holy Prophet, Isaiah, B.C. 714. 2d ed. (1st ed. written under the name "Badger.") Introduced by Mrs. Piazzi Smyth. London: Banks, 1890. Pp. 68, 8vo, 6d.

Gossner, Johs. Die heiligen Schriften des neuen Testament mit Erklärungen und Betrachtungen. IV. Thei. Das Evangelium Johannes. Hamburg: Ev. Buchhandlung, 1890. Pp. 320, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Gottlieb. Christ oder Antichrist? Beiträge zur Abwehr gegen Angriffe auf die religiöse Wahrheit. 2. Bd.: Der Krach von Wittenberg. Blicke auf den religiösen Wirrwar der Gegenwart. Berlin: Germania, 1890. Pp. 683, 8vo, 4.20 mk.

Groot, Fr. J. V. de. Summa apologetica de ecclesia Catholica ad mentem S. Thomæ Aquinatis. Regensburg: Verlags-Anstalt, 1890. 2. Bde. Pp. xi., 394, viii., 368, 8vo, 10 mk.

Grouchy, Le Vicomte de. Documents inédits sur Blaise Pascal, suivis de son testament et de son billet d'enterrement. Paris: Danpeley-Gouverneur, 1890. Pp. 17, 8vo.

Grundzüge der Missionswissenschaft, nebst einigen auszuführenden Vorschlägen und einem Anhang von Sartorius Episcopus. Berlin: Schneider, 1890. Pp. viii., 112, 8vo, 5 mk.

Halévy, J. Recherches bibliques. 10e fascicule. Versailles: Cerf, 1890. Pp. 417–470, 8vo.

Hartel, W. v. Patristische Studien. IV. Zu Tertullian de oratione, de baptismo, de pudicitia, de ieiunio, de anima. Wien: Tempsky, 1890. Pp. 90, 8vo, 1 60 mk.

Hartmann, F. In the Pronaos of the Temple of Wisdom Containing the History of the True and the False Rosicrucians. London, 1890. Pp. 126, 8vo, 8s.

Hassano Bar Bahlule. Lexicon Syriacum. Voces syriacas græcasque cum glossis syriacis et arabicis complectens e pluribus codicibus edidit et notulis instruxit Rubens Duval. Fasciculus secundus. Paris: Bouillon, 1890. Pp. xxiii., xxxiv., 349-780, 4to, à 2 col., 20 fr.

Hauréau, B. Des poèmes latins attribués à Saint Bernard. Paris: Klinksieck, 1890. Pp. 102, 8vo.

Hefele, C. J. v. Conciliengeschichte. Nach den Quellen bearbeitet. 6. Bd. 2. Auflage, besorgt von A. Knöpfler. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1890. Pp. xviii., 1091, 8vo, 12 mk.

Hemenway, Francis. Life and Selected Writings of ——, late Professor of Hebrew and Biblical Literature in the Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. (By Prof C. F. Bradley, A. W. Patton, and C. M. Stuart.) Cincinnati and Chicago: Cranston, 1890. $2.

Hibbard, F. G., D.D. Eschatology; or, The Doctrine of the Last Things, According to the Chronology and Symbolism of the Apocalypse. New York: Hunt, 1890. Pp. vii., 360, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Hillebrandt, Alfr , Prof., Dr. Die Sonnwendfeste in Alt-Indien. Eine Untersuchung. Erlangen: Junge, 1889. Pp. 46, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Horton, Robert F. Inspiration und the Bible: An Inquiry. New York: Dutton, 1890. Pp. x., 256, 12mo, cloth, $1 25.

Innes, A. Taylor. Church and State: A Historical Handbook. (Handbooks for Bible classes and private students.) Edinburgh: Clark, 1890. Pp. 275, 8vo, 3s.

Jacobs, Henry Eyster, D.D. A Study in Comparative Symbolics. The Lutheran Movement in England during the Reigns of Richard VIII. and Edward VI., and its Literary Monuments. Philadelphia: Fredericks, 1890. Pp. xv., 376, 8vo, $2.

Janet, Paul. Eléments de philosophie scientifique et de philosophie morale. Paris: Delagrave, 1890. Pp. 539, 12mo.

Kaufmann, David, Prof. Dr. Franz Delitzsch. Ein Palmblatt aus Juda auf sein frisches Grab. Berlin: Jüdischen Presse, 1890. Pp. 22, 8vo, 50 pf.

Kessler, W. Die asaphitische Psalmengruppe in Beziehung auf Mackabäische Lieder untersucht. Halle a. S.: Waisenhaus, 1889. Pp. ii., 32, 8vo.

Klöti, W. Shakespeare als religiöser Dichter. Zürich: Hohr, 1890. Pp. 107, 8vo, 1.70 mk.

Krall, Jak. Studien zur Geschichte der alten Aegypten. IV. Das Land Punt. Wien: Tempsky, 1890. Pp. 82, 8vo, 1.60 mk. (I.–IV., 5.70 mk.)

Kremer, A. R., Rev., A.M. A Biographical Sketch of John Williamson Nevin, D.D., LL.D. Reading, Pa.: Miller, 1890. Pp. 235, 12mo.

Kurt, R., Willensfreiheit? Eine kritische Untersuchung für Gebildete aller Kreise. Leipzig: Friedrich, 1890. Pp. 136, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Lahondès, Jules de. Toulouse chrétienne. L'Eglise Saint-Étienne, cathédrale de Toulouse. Toulouse: Douladore-Privat, 1890. Pp. xlv., 482, 8vo.

Lang, John Marshall. Gideon and the Judges: A Study, Practical and Historical. (Men of the Bible.) London: Nisbet, 1890. Pp. 201, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Lea, Henry Charles, LL.D. Chapters from the Religious History of Spain. Connected with the Inquisition. Philadelphia: Lea, 1890. Pp. xii., 522, 12mo.

Letourneau, C. Science et Materialisme. Paris: Reinwald, 1890. Pp. viii., 470, 18mo.

Lewis, W. H., D.D. The History of Methodism in Missouri for a Decade of Years from 1860 to 1870. Nashville, Tenn.: M. E. Pub. House, 1890. Pp. 460, 8vo. (Vol I., published 188—, 2d vol. in course of preparation.)

Lunn, Henry S., Rev. A Friend of Missions in India. The Cyclostyled Indian Journal of Rev. Henry S. Lunn. Edinburgh: Clarke, 1890. Pp. 152, 8vo, 1s.

McCave, Canon, and **Breen,** J. D., Rev. "Continuity" or Collapse? Ed. by Rev. J. B. Mackinlay. (The Alcester Lectures.) London: Art and Book Co., 1890. Pp. 108, 8vo, 1s.

McMurry, Frank. Herbert Spencer's Erziehungslehre kritisch untersucht. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1890. 8vo, 1 mk.

Mahler, Ed., Dr. Maimonides' Kiddusch Hachodesch. Uebersetzt und erklärt. Wien: Lippe, 1889. Pp. iv., 115, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

Martyn, Carlos. Wendell Phillips the Agitator. With an appendix containing three of the orator's masterpieces. New York and London: Funk & W., 1890. Cloth.

Maumus, Elisée-Vincent, D.D. Saint Thomas d'Aquin et la philosophie cartésienne. Études de doctrines comparées. Paris: Quelquejen, 1890. 2 vols., pp. 511, 459, 18mo.

Meyer, F. B., Rev., B.A. Tried by Fire: Expositions of the First Epistle of Peter. London: Morgan, 1890. Pp. 228, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Miller, J. R., Rev. Come Ye Apart: Daily Readings in the Life of Christ. London: Nelsons, 1890. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Mirbt, C., Prof. Die Enstehung des Papsttums. Vortrag. [Heft 45 of Flugschriften des evangelischen Bundes.] Leipzig: Braun, 1890. Pp. 30, 8vo, 40 pf.

Moinet, C., Rev. The Great Alternative, and other Sermons. London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. 290, 8vo, 6s.

Monfat, A., Rev. Le Missionare des Samoa. Mgr. L. Elloy, de la Société de Marie, évêque titulaire de Tipasa. Paris: Vic, 1890. Pp. 466, 8vo.

Mortimer, Alfred G., Rev. Learn of Jesus Christ to Die: Addresses on the Words of our Lord from the Cross, Taken as Teaching the Way of Preparation for Death. London: Masters, 1890. Pp. x., 104, 16mo, 2s.

Müller, Adf. Die philosophische und die christliche Gewissheit über die Unsterblichkeit der Menschenseele. Ein Vergleich mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von G. Teich-Müller's Schrift über dieser Gegenstand. Altenberg, 1890. 8vo, 60 pf.

Müntz, —. Les constructions du pape Urbain V. à Monpellier (1364 à 1370) d'après les archives secrètes du Vatican. Paris: Leroux, 1890. Pp. 23, 8vo.

Murphy, J. B. C., Rev. Through Fast and Festival: Being a Complete Set of Sermons for the Christian Year. Part 4. London: Skeffington, 1890. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Murray, David Christie, and **Hermann,** Henry. The Bishop's Bible. New York: Lovell Co., 1890. Paper, 50 cts.

Newton, Richard, Rev., D.D. Illustrated Rambles in Bible Lands. Philadelphia: Am. S. S. Un., 1890. Pp. viii., 254, 8vo, $1.50.

Nirschl, J. Prof., Dr. Die Therapeuten. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1890. Pp. 56, 8vo, 60 pf.

Nöldeke, Th. Delectus Veterum carminum Arabicorum. Carmina selegit et edidit. Th. N. Glossarium confecit A. Müller (in Porta Linguarum Orientalium Series). Berlin: Reuther, 1890. Pp. xvi., 240, 12mo, $2.60.

Parisis, Mgr. Évêque de Langres. Liberté de l'Église. Du silence et de la publicité. Paris: Petitheury, 1890. Pp. 101, 18mo.

Petitot, Émile. Accord des mythologies dans la cosmogonie des Danites arctiques. Paris: Bouillon. 8vo, 2.80 mk.

Philippi, Friedr. Ad. Kirchliche Glaubenslehre. V. Die Zueignung der Gottesgemeinschaft. 3. Abth. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1890. Pp. 292, 8vo, 4.50 mk.

Planudis, Maximi, Monachi, Epistulæ. Edidit Max Treu, Breslau, 1890. Pp. 284, 8vo. New York, $2.20.

Plümacher, O. Der Kampf um's Unbewusste. Nebst einem Verzeichniss der Hartmann. Literatur von 1868–90. Leipzig: Friedrich, 1890. 2 Aufl., pp. x., 174, 8vo, 4 mk.

Polek, Joh., Dr. Der Protestantismus in der Bukowina. Czernowitz: Pardini, 1890. Pp. 114, 8vo, 1 mk.

Pooler, L. A. A Short History of the Church of Ireland. Belfast: Olley, 1890. Pp. 174, 8vo, 1s. 4d.

Povey, J. M. Nunnery Life in the Church of England; or, Seventeen Years with Father Ignatius. By Sister Mary Agnes. Edited, with a Preface, by W. Lancelot Holland. London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. 240, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Preuss, G. Die Profetie Joel's unter besonderer Rücksicht der Zeitfrage. Inaugural Dissertation von Halle. Halle a. S., 1889. Pp. iv., 134, 8vo.

Pulsford, John. Loyalty to Christ. (The Personal and Historic Christ.) Vol. I. "These Sayings of Mine." London: Simpkin, 1890. Pp. 390, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Reade, H. L. The Story of a Heathen and his Transformation. Boston: Cong. S. S. and Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. v., 82, 12mo, cloth, 60 cts.

Reinell, Wilhelm, Dr. Luther, Crotus und Hutten. Eine quellenmässige Darstellung des Verhältnisses Luthers zum Humanismus. Marburg: Ehrhardt, 1890. Pp. viii., 134, 8vo ($1), 2.70 mk.

Reinisch, L. Das Zalwort 4. und 9 in den chamitisch-semitisch Sprachen. Wien: Tempsky, 1890. Pp. 40, 8vo, 80 pf.

Riehm, E. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von A. Brandt. Lieferungen 11–13. Halle a. S.: Strien, 1890. Pp. viii., 321–562, 8vo, 5 mk. (2 vols. complete, 20 mk.)

Rocholl, —. Zur Weltstellung des israelitischen Volkes (Schriften des Institutum judaicum, Nr. 26.) Leipzig: Faber, 1890. Pp. 15, 8vo, 40 pf.

Rubin, S., Dr. Kurzgefasste Encyklopädie aller Wissenschaften mit Hinblick auf deren Gestaltung im Alterthum, resp. im biblischen Zeitalter (in hebräische Sprache). Wien: Lippe, 1890. Pp. 80, 8vo, 2 mk.

Sabatier, A. De la vie intime des dogmes et de leur puissance d'évolution. Paris: Fischbacker, 1890. 12mo, 1 fr.

Schleiermacher's Sermons. The Foreign Biblical Library. Edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, LL.D. New York: Funk & W., 1890. Cloth.

Schulze, Gust. Carl Alb. Pietismus, Ritschlsche Theologie und Luthertum. Hannover: Feesche, 1890. Pp. 64, 8vo, 1 mk.

Selle, F. De aramaismis libri Ezechielis. Inaug.-Diss. von Halle. Halis: Kaemmer, 1890. Pp. 50, 8vo.

Sepp, Johann W. Bernhard, Prof. Dr. Kritische Beiträge zum Leben Jesu und zur neutestamentliche Topographie Palästinas. Beiläge: Neue Forschungen über die Felsenkuppel in Jerusalem. München: Lindauer, 1890. Pp. 175, viii., 28, 8vo, 3 mk.

Shedd's, Dr., "The Proposed Revision of the Westminster Standards," Some Comments upon. Boston: Damrell, 1890. Pp. 92, 12mo.

Shurman, Jacob Gould. Belief in God: Its Origin, Nature, and Basis. Winkley Lectures, Andover Theological Seminary, 1890. New York: Scribner, 1890. Cloth, $1.25.

Smith, Charles Edward. The World Lighted. A Study of the Apocalypse. New York and London: Funk, 1890. Pp. v., 218, 12mo, 75 cts.

Stähelin, O. Observationes criticæ in Clementem Alex andrinum. (I. De codicibus et editionibus. II. De singulis locis.) Diss. inaug. Erlangæ: Junge, 1890. Pp. 43, 8vo.

Steidl, Adf. Die Missionen der Kapuziner in der Gegenwart, nach authentischen Berichten zusammengestelt. Meran: Jandl. Pp. 112, 8vo, 2 mk.

Stock, Otto, Dr. Kantianismus und Kriticismus. I. Das Problem der Kritik der reinen Vernunft. Stargard Fock: 1890. Pp. 22, 4to, 1 mk.

Strong, James, Prof. Sacred Idyls. A Metrical Version of Solomon's Song. With Appropriate Explanations. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1889. Pp. 74, 4to, $1.50.

Tam, Rabbenu. Das Buch vom rechten Lebenswandel, angeblich von R T., nach den ältesten und correctesten Ausgaben zum ersten Male in's Deutsch übertr. Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann, 1890. Pp. 142, 8vo, 1 mk.

Todd, Elbert, S., D.D. Christian Missions in the Nineteenth Century. New York: Hunt, 1890. Pp. ii., 174, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Totten, Charles A. L. Joshua's Long Day and the Dial of Ahaz. A Scientific Vindication and a Midnight Cry. New Haven: Our Race Pub. Co., 1890. Pp. lxvi., 293, 12mo, 75 cts.

Van Dyke, Henry J., Rev., D.D. The Church: Her Ministry and Sacraments: Lectures Delivered at Princeton, 1890. New York: Randolph, 1890. Pp. ix., 265, 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Vincent, Marvin R., D.D. Word Studies in the New Testament. Vol. III. The Epistles of Paul, Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon. New York: Scribners, 1890. Pp. xl., 565, 8vo.

Waldmeier, Theophilus. Autobiography. Being an Account of Ten Years' Life in Abyssinia and Sixteen Years in Syria. London: Partridge, 1890. Pp. 336, 8vo, 2s.

Watkins, Henry Wm., M.A, D.D. Modern Criticism. Considered in its Relation to the Fourth Gospel. New York: Dutton, 1890. Pp. xxxix., 502, 8vo, $5.

Watkinson, W. L., Rev. Lessons of Prosperity and Other Addresses Delivered at Noonday in the Philosophical Hall, Leeds. London: Wesl. Conf. Off., 1890. Pp. 179, 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Welz, J. V., Baron. Der Missionsweckruf, in treuer wiedergabe des orig. Drucks vom Jahre 1664. (Faber's Missionsbibliothek, Nr. 1.) Leipzig: Faber, 1890. Pp. iv., 68, 8vo, 1 mk.

Werchowskÿ, I. Stimme eines griechisch-katholischen Christen gegen den Papismus. Aus dem Russischen. Mit einem Vorwort des Verfassers zur deutschen Ausgabe. Leipzig: Schmaler, 1890. Pp. xlv., 94, 8vo, 4 mk.

Wolff, Hermann, Dr. Handbuch der Ethik. Leipzig: Friedrich, 1890. Pp. xii., 194, 8vo, 2 mk.

Zahn, Th. Die soziale Frage und die innere Mission nach dem Brief des Jakobus. (Bibliothek für innere Mission. Nr. 2.) Leipzig: Faber, 1890. Pp. 21, 8vo, 50 pf.

NOTICES OF MAGAZINES.

IN view of the reprints of the 1847 edition of Webster's Dictionary by means of photography, now on sale, it is pleasant to call attention to the new Webster recently issued by the Messrs. Merriam. This edition bears the title of the "International." It is largely a new work, for upon it a band of specialists and editors have been laboring for the past ten years, under the management of ex-President Porter, of Yale. Being brought out in finished form and in one volume, it is of course more immediately useful than the *Century Dictionary*. The illustrations are numerous and good.

THE CENTURY for November has the following contents: "An American in Tibet," an account of a journey through an unknown land; through Northern China to the Koko-nor, by W. Woodville Rockhill (illustrated); "Two French Sculptors: Rodin and Dalou," by W. C. Brownell (illustrated); "The Pawnbroker" (a poem), by Edgar Fawcett; "Life in the White House in the Time of Lincoln," by John Hay: "The Courageous Action of Lucia Richmond," by Frank Pope Humphrey; "The Epitaph" (a poem), by James T. McKay; "Bereaved" (a poem), by James Whitcomb Riley; "A Legend of Old New York," by the author of "Jufrow van Steen," Anna Eichberg King (illustrated); "Sunset and Shore" (a poem), by George Parsons Lathrop; "Love, Art, and Time" (a poem), by R. W. Gilder; picture in "Century Series of American Pictures," by Will H. Low; "Colonel Carter of Cartersville," I., by F. Hopkinson Smith (illustrated); "Luca Signorelli" (Italian Old Masters), by W. J. Stillman, with notes and an engraving by T. Cole; "The Instruction of St. Cosmo and St. Damian" (a poem), by Thomas A. Janvier; "Early Victories of the American Navy," new facts from French sources, by Edgar S. Maclay (illustrated); "Yesterday" (a poem), by John Vance Cheney; "The Printing of 'The Century,'" by Theodore L De Vinne (illustrated); "On the Andersonville Circuit," by J. T. King (illustrated); "The First Emigrant Train to California," by Gen. John Bidwell (illustrated); "Californiana: Grizzly and Pioneer," by Charles Howard Shinn; "How London is Governed," by Albert Shaw; "The Return of the Dead," by Arlo Bates. These articles are followed by the departments, "Topics of the Time," "Open Letters," and "Bric-à-brac." Several of the articles mentioned belong to series, as do those of Messrs. Rockhill, J. T. King, and Bidwell. The number celebrates its twentieth anniversary fitly by Mr. De Vinne's article. The progress in printing and preparing wood-cuts has been remarkable during the past twenty years.

LIPPINCOTT'S for November has this table of contents: "A Laggard in Love," by Jeanie Gwynne Bettany; "Heroines of the Human Comedy," by Junius Henri Browne; "Where lies the Land?" (a poem), by Charles D Bell; "Some Experiences of a Stump Speaker," by B. F. Hughes; "A Philosopher in the Purple," by G. Barnett Smith; "My Lady Waits" (a poem), by Charles Washington Coleman; "Bond's," by M. P.; "The Famous Sonnet of Arvers" (a poem), translated by Mrs. E. W. Latimer; "Whom Others Envy" (a poem), by Rose Hartwick Thorpe; "Accidents and Trifles," by William Shepard; "British Side-Glances at America," by Anne H. Wharton; "Journalism versus Literature," by W. J. Henderson; "Book-Talk," by Julian Hawthorne and Melville Philips; "New Books;" "With the Wits" (illustrated by leading artists).

SCRIBNER'S for November contains several notable articles. Mr. Herbert Ward, the African traveller, tells "The Tale of a Tusk of Ivory," and Professor N. S. Shaler discourses in ethnography. Lieut. Zogbaum defends the officers of the White Squadron from the charges of undue severity of discipline which have been circulated by the newspapers. The unusual feature of an article written, drawn, and engraved by the same hand appears in "A Day with a Country Doctor," by Frank French. It is doubtful whether the survey of the great railroad in the Andes surpassed in danger and stirring adventures the exploits of the engineering party led by Robert Brewster Stanton, last winter, through the cañons of the Colorado. In less than five hundred miles five hundred and twenty rapids, falls, and cataracts were encountered. Mr. Stanton describes this expedition. A remarkable series of photographs was taken, some of which are used to illustrate the article. A number of nurses in the New York City Training School have written for Mrs. Frederick Rhinelander Jones (who offered prizes for the best) sketches of their actual experiences in a typical day, or night, of hospital work. These are embodied in Mrs. Jones's article "On the Training of a Nurse." Two Sonnets on Cardinal Newman appear, one by Aubrey de Vere, the aged Irish poet, and the other by Inigo Deane, a disciple and friend of the late Cardinal. F. J. Stimson, the author of "Mrs. Knollys" and other short stories collected in "The Sentimental Calendar," contributes "Dr. Materialismus."

HARPER'S for November has this table of contents: "Our Italy," by Charles Dudley Warner (illustrated; a paper describing the climate and resources of Southern California); "Too Late!" (a poem), by Julian Hawthorne; "A Halloween Wraith" (a story), by William Black (illustrated); "The World Runs On" (a poem), by Rose Hawthorne Lathrop; "Der Meistertrunk," the festival play of Rothenburg, by E. W. Mealey (illustrated; an interesting description of a quaint old town and of its annual festival play—a play as unique and attractive in its way as the famous passion play at Oberammergau); "A Winter Journey to Japan," by Lafcadio Hearn (from Montreal to Vancouver, and thence across the Pacific to Japan); "A Quatrain" (a poem), by Bliss Carman; "Madrilène; or, the Festival of the Dead" (a story), by Grace King; "Princeton University," by Professor W. M. Sloane (the history, methods, and aims of this celebrated institution); "Urban and Commercial Chili," by Theodore Child (illustrated); "On Waking from a Dreamless Sleep" (a poem), by Annie Fields; "Switzerland and the Swiss," by S. H. M. Byers (an account of the institutions and people of Switzerland by one who was for sixteen years a resident of that country); "Portraits" (a story), by Ruth Dana Draper; "The Quaker Lady" (a poem), by S. Weir Mitchell, M.D., LL.D. (illustrated); "In November" (a poem), by Archibald Lampman; "Port Tarascon: The Last Adventures of the Illustrious Tartarin," VI., by Alphonse Daudet, translated by Henry James (illustrated); Monthly Record of Current Events (to September 17th).

THE
MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 3. DECEMBER, 1890. No. 3.

For THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

DID LUTHER COMMIT SUICIDE?*

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.

ON the 18th of February, 1546, Dr. Martin Luther breathed his last in the town of Eisleben, where he had been born on the 10th of November, 1483, and all that was mortal of the man who had shaken the church and the world was a lifeless corpse. The immediate cause of his death was apoplexy of the heart, but he had been a sufferer from bodily infirmities for several years. It is a wonder that he did not collapse sooner under the burden of his herculean conflict with the most powerful system of spiritual despotism that had for centuries controlled the consciences of Christian Europe. It might have been better for his fame if he had died sixteen years earlier in the Coburg during the Diet of Augsburg, when he stood at the height of his power and usefulness.

During the last spring and summer a lively controversy has been carried on in Germany between Romanists and Protestants about Luther's death. It was begun by Paul Majunke, who seriously revived the long exploded myth of Luther's suicide. Majunke is a Roman Catholic priest, and was once a deputy to the Prussian Chambers, and editor of the "Germania," the chief organ of Ultramontanism in Berlin, where, according to the prophecy of Cardinal Wiseman, the war between Romanism and Protestantism is to be fought out. His pamphlet soon passed through four editions (which means a great deal, since pamphlets seldom pay the expense of printing). It was followed by a reply to his opponents, and by another, which he calls *A Last Word to the Luther-Poets* (meaning the Protestant biographers of Luther). His story is that Luther, after a hearty supper, in which he, as usual, freely indulged in wine, died suddenly, unexpectedly, and miserably by his own hand. His chief authority is an unknown servant of Luther, who, many years after his death, is reported to have stated that he found his master on the morning of February 18th, 1546, "*juxta lectum suum pensilem et misere strangulatum*" (p. 27). All his other authorities are rabid Romanists—Cochlæus, Cornelius a Lapide, Sedulius, Bozius, Helmesius, Hosius—and merely repeat, with various modifications and partial contradictions, the rumor of a sudden and violent death of Luther, inflicted on him either by his own hand, or by the devil.

Majunke's cause was supported by a certain Dr. Martin Honef, in a pamphlet of 92 pages, in which he repeats over and over again, without a shadow of proof except vague rumor, that Luther hung himself by his handkerchief on the bedpost! I have never read a more worthless tract, but it deserves to be mentioned as an illustration of the silly superstition and low vulgarity of which a certain class of ignorant or malignant Romanists are capable.* Fortunately, there are other Catholics, even of the extreme Ultramontane school, who are fair-minded, honest, and scholarly enough to repudiate these productions and to give credit to the truth of history. Even Janssen, the champion of the literary revival of German Ultramontanism, who was first reported to agree with Majunke, wrote to him (as he has the manliness to inform the public in his *Last Word*, p. 51) that the assertion of Luther's suicide did not seem to him to have sufficient foundation.

---

* *Luthers Lebensende. Eine historische Untersuchung von* PAUL MAJUNKE. Vierte vermehrte Auflage. Mainz, 1890 (pp. 102). *Die historische Kritik über Luthers Lebensende, von* PAUL MAJUNKE. Mainz, 1890 (pp. 106).—*Luthers Selbstmord. Eine Geschichtslüge P. Majunke's beleuchtet von* Dr. TH. KOLDE, *ord. Prof. der hist. Theologie in Erlangen.* Dritte verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Erlangen und Leipzig, 1890 (pp. 45). *Noch einmal Luthers Selbstmord. Erwiderung auf Majunke's neueste Schrift von* Dr. TH. KOLDE, *ordentlicher Prof. in Erlangen.* Erlangen und Leipzig, 1890 (pp. 28).—*Dr. Kolde und die Schrift Majunke's über Luther's Tod*, in the "Historisch-Politische Blätter" (Rom. Cath.), Bd. 106, No. 1 München, 1890.—*Luthers Lebensende in neuester ultramontaner Beleuchtung von* Dr. GUSTAV KAWERAU, *Prof. der Theologie in Kiel.* Barmen, 1890 (pp. 40).—*Ein letztes Wort an die Luther—Dichter von* PAUL MAJUNKE. Mainz, 1890 (pp. 52). With a picture of the house in Eisleben where Luther died.—*Der Selbstmord Luthers, geschichtlich erwiesen von* Dr. MARTIN HONEF. München, 1890 (pp. 92). Several newspaper articles on this controversy are noticed by Majunke in his second pamphlet, pp. S—35.

* The following extract may serve as a fair specimen (pp. 59 sqq.): "*Schrecklich und geheimnissvoll ist die Art, wie Luther von dieser Welt geschieden, schrecklich und geheimnissvoll sind die Umstände, unter denen er begraben wurde. Ueber alles interessant ist der Bericht des Helmesius über die Raben, welche Luther's Leiche folgten. Als die Leiche Luthers auf dem Wege von Eisleben nach Wittenberg die Stadt Halle erreichte, so erzählt er, und mit grösstem Pompe in die Kirche der Jungfrau Maria gebracht wurde, war die Menge der Raben,*

Majunke was answered by two eminent Luther-scholars, Professor Dr. Kolde, of Erlangen, and Professor Dr. Kawerau, of Kiel. They have successfully vindicated the truth of history against the falsehood of slander for all those who have not closed their ears against the clear and strong testimonies of honest and reliable witnesses.

The controversy forms a characteristic episode in the great literary war between Romanism and Protestantism, which has been revived and stimulated by the *Culturkampf* and the conflict between Prince Bismarck and the Pope about the anti-papal May-laws of Prussia. It is, therefore, worthy of serious discussion.

A false story of Luther's death was started a year before it actually occurred by an anonymous Italian writer in a small pamphlet, which is embodied in Luther's works.* According to this premature report, Luther, on his sick bed, demanded and received the holy sacrament of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and died forthwith. Before his death he had ordered that his body be put on the altar and worshipped as a god (*come Dio fosse adorato*), but at his burial a terrible voice and commotion, like a tempest from hell, was heard, and scared the bystanders. When they looked up to heaven, they saw the most holy sacrament in the air. On the next day, in opening the grave, neither flesh nor bone nor clothing was seen, but a vile sulphur stench arose and sickened all who were present. By this occurrence many were converted to the holy Church, which is the pillar of the truth.

Luther republished this Italian pamphlet with a German translation and some notes, in which he says: "I, Martinus Lutherus D., confess and bear witness with this writing that I received this wrathful fiction of my death on the 21st of March, and have read it with great pleasure, except the blasphemy. . . . May God convert the pope and the papists from the devil."

Majunke has the audacity to assert that this story was manufactured by Luther himself to counteract the Council at Trent, which assembled in the same year. But Luther knew little or no Italian, and the pamphlet was sent to him by Philip of Hesse with a letter dated March 12th, 1545, which is printed in Rommel's *Philipp von Hessen* III., 108, and in Kolde's reply to Majunke, p. 22. The Landgraf informed Luther that he had received the pamphlet from an honest man at Augsburg, that he had it translated by one of his courtiers who knew Italian, and that he wished it to be returned to him. He wrote on the same day to the Elector of Saxony, asking him to forward the tract to Luther, and inclosing the writing of his Augsburg correspondent, who said that the libel had been printed in Naples and many other places (Seckendorf, *Hist. Lutheranismi*, III., 580). We have also the reply of the Elector that he had forwarded the libel (Seckendorf, *l. c.*), and Luther's reply of March 21st, in which he says: "I shall have the tract printed in Italian and German, as it is not worthy of another answer. I will only show that I have read it" (Seidemann's supplement to De Wette's ed. of Luther's *Briefwechsel*, VI., 373).

After Luther's death, the imagination of his enemies invented all sorts of rumors—that he committed suicide, or that the Devil made away with him; that a cloud of black ravens followed his corpse; that the coffin was found empty, but filled with an intolerable, infernal stench.

We need not wonder at these and similar rumors. It seemed impossible to super-

---

welche mit der Leiche gekommen und am anderen Tage mit ihr weiter zog, so gross, dass kein Menschenalter sich erinnern kann, je eine grössere Menge Raben gesehen zu haben. Ja, die Menge der Raben, welche mit dem Kadaver Luthers angekommen, war so gross, dass die Dächer der Häuser und die Zweige der Bäume kaum hinreichten, um jedem Raben ein Plätzchen zu gewähren, Die Lutheraner, welche bei der Leiche die Wache hielten, sangen die ganze Nacht hindurch ihre lutheranischen Kirchengesänge. Nicht minder schrieen die auf den Dächern und Bäumen sitzenden Raben die ganze Nacht hindurch ohne Untertass. Beide, Lutheraner und Raben, erfüllten die Nacht mit ihrem Geschrei, so dass man zuweilen nicht unterscheiden konnte, ob das Geschrei der Lutheraner die Raben oder das Geschrei der Raben die Lutheraner übertönte. So wie diese zahllosen Raben mit der Leiche Luthers gekommen, verliessen sie auch mit der Leiche Luthers am frühen Morgen wiederum die Stadt. Unzählige Raben folgten so der Leiche Luthers.

"*Helmesius selber kam kurz darauf nach Halle, wo ihm diese merkwürdige Thatsache erzählt wurde und alle Welt davon sprach. Eine merkwürdigere Begleitung hat gewiss noch kein Sterblicher nach seinem Tode gehabt, so lange die Welt steht. Es wird schwer halten, diese sonderbare Thatsache auf eine ganz natürliche Weise zu erklären.*

"*Man spricht viel von einem pestilenzialischen Gestank, welchen trotz der eisigen Kälte von der Leiche Luthers ausgegangen, so dass es Menschen unmöglich gewesen, die Leiche vom Stadtthore Wittenbergs in die Schlosskirche zu tragen und man hierzu Pferde verwenden musste. Ist nun dieser pestilenzialische Gestank auch noch sa gross gewesen, so kann er doch nicht ein hinreichender Erklärungsgrund für diese aussergewöhnliche Versammlung von Raben abgeben, welche der Leiche Luthers gefolgt sind.*

"*Das Auge, das seinen Vater verachtet und schief auf seine Mutter blickt, sollen die Raben aushacken, so spricht der hl. Geist.*"

* *Welsche Lügenschrift von D. Martin Luthers Tod zu Rom ausgegangen. Anno* 1545. First printed under this title at Wittenberg, 1545. In Walch's ed. of Luther's *Werke*, vol. xxi., second part, 252-257; Erlangen ed., vol. xxxii., 425-430.

stitious Papists that such an arch-heretic as Luther should be permitted to depart in peace. The belief that there is an intimate connection between sin and punishment, which is true in general, but not in all particular cases, was entertained and falsely applied by the enemies of Job, and was rebuked by our Lord in the case of the man born blind (John ix. 3). Lactantius wrote a book (*De Mortibus Persecutorum*) to trace in the terrible deaths of the persecuting emperors the punitive justice of God, but forgot that Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, who persecuted the Church (ignorantly, like Saul), were among the best emperors, and died a natural death. The sudden death of Arius in the water-closet was construed by the friends of Athanasius into a signal judgment and warning against heresy. After the death of Œcolampadius the Romanists started the rumor that he had committed suicide, and even Luther was inclined to believe it; for he never entirely overcame the intolerance of the mediæval church in which he was brought up, and he believed in the power of the devil to kill people. He also regarded the tragical death of Zwingli at Cappel as a divine judgment for his heresy on the doctrine of the real presence, and doubted whether he was saved. In our day, after the death of Dr. Döllinger, which occurred January 10th, 1890, two false reports were circulated in Catholic newspapers, one that he died like Arius, the other that he had recanted his Old Catholicism and returned to the Roman Church. The first report was instantly refuted by the testimony of his physician, the second by the posthumous publication of his Letters, in which he declines all invitations to return. (*Briefe und Erklärungen von J. von Döllinger über die Vaticanischen Decrete,* edited by his friend, Dr. Reusch, of Bonn, München, 1890. Compare an article in this MAGAZINE, Vol. III., 132 sqq.) It is well known that the story is industriously circulated and actually believed by thousands of ignorant Catholics that the poor pope since 1870 is literally a prisoner in the Vatican, and obliged to sleep on bare straw, although the Vatican has 11,000 rooms, with plenty of good beds, and is surrounded by one of the largest and finest of gardens.

Let us now review the authentic facts of Luther's death.

1. From the last few weeks of Luther's life we have his own letters to his wife and to Melanchthon.* In these he gives an account of the incidents which occurred on his journey from Wittenberg to Eisleben from January 25th till February 14th, 1546—that is, till four days before his death. He complains of his ill health and the infirmities of old age, and has some hard words to say about the fifty Jews at Eisleben and the lawyers whom he disliked; but upon the whole he was in good spirits, and indulged in his usual quaint humor. He addresses his wife: "*Meiner lieben Hausfrauen Katharin Lutherin Doctorin Zulsdorferin, Saumärkterin und was sie mehr sein kann;*" also "*Der tiefgelehrten Frauen Katharin Lutherin, meiner gnädigen Hausfrauen zu Wittenberg.*" He informs her that he liked the "Naumburgisch Bier" and the Rhine-wine to which he was liberally treated at Eisleben by the Counts of Mansfeld. He allays her fears concerning his health by directing her to the Gospel of John and to his little Catechism, and reminds her that God Almighty could make ten Doctor Luthers without any trouble.* In the last two letters to Melanchthon and to his *Kæthe* (both written February 14th) he informs them that the business which had called him to Eisleben was satisfactorily adjusted, and that he expected to return within a week to Wittenberg. There is not a word nor a hint in all these last utterances of Luther that he was in the least shaken in his faith or clouded in his mind, or contemplated doing any violence to himself. They prove just the reverse.

2. Luther's last manuscript. On the 16th of February, two days before his death, he wrote the following sentences on a piece of paper, which was found on his desk after his death:

"Virgil in his Bucolicis no one can understand, unless he has been a shepherd five years;

"Virgil in his Georgicis no one can understand, unless he has been a farmer five years;

"Cicero in his Epistles no one can understand, unless he has moved in a great commonwealth twenty-five years;

"The Holy Scriptures no one should pretend to have sufficiently tasted, unless he has ruled congregations for the space of a hundred years, with prophets like Elijah and Elisha, John the Baptist, Christ and the Apostles.

---

* In De Wette's edition of *Luther's Briefe, Sendschreiben und Bedenken,* vol. v., 780-792.

* "*Du willst sorgen,*" he writes, Feb. 7 (De Wette, v., 787), "*für deinen Gott, gerade als wäre er nicht allmächtig, der da könnte zehn Doctor Martinus schaffen, wo der einige alte ersöffe in der Saal oder im Ofenloch oder auf Wolfes Vogelheerd. Lass mich in Frieden mit deiner Sorge, ich hab einen besseren Sorger, denn du und alle Engel sind. Der liegt in der Krippen und häuget an einer Jungfrauen Zitzen; aber sitzet gleichwohl zur rechten Hand Gottes des allmächtigen Vaters. Darumb sei in Frieden. Amen.*"

> " '*Hanc tu ne divinam Æneïda tenta,*
> *Sed vestigia pronus adora.*'*

"We are beggars. This is true.† 16 February, anno 1546."

These are the last words from the pen of the Reformer. They are thoroughly characteristic, and bear testimony to his humility and deep sense of the inexhaustible riches of the Word of God. No one would infer from this document, which Majunke ignores, that the dying author was on the eve of committing suicide.

3. A full account of Luther's last journey, sickness, and death was prepared by three friends and eye-witnesses, Dr. JUSTUS JONAS, of Halle, Magister MICHAEL CŒLIUS, court-chaplain at Eisleben, and AURIFABER, Luther's secretary and editor of his table talk, at the request of the Elector of Saxony. They state at the close that they were present at the happy end of Father Luther till his last breath, and that they have reported nothing but what they had heard and seen, together with princes, counts, lords and others who were present. The document was printed at Wittenberg and Frankfurt, in 1546, in pamphlet form, and is incorporated in the larger editions of Luther's works.‡

The following are the principal facts according to these three witnesses:

On the 23d day of January, 1546, Luther left Wittenberg reluctantly in obedience to an invitation of the Counts of Mansfeld, who desired him to settle a controversy between them. He ventured on the perilous winter journey in the hope of making peace. The first night he stopped at Bitterfeld. On the 24th, at 11 A.M., he reached Halle, and spent three days with his friend and former colleague, Dr. Jonas. He was detained by sickness (the stone from which he suffered much); nevertheless he preached on the conversion of Paul in the Church of Our Dear Lady.

On the 28th of January he set out for Eisleben, accompanied by his three sons and Dr. Jonas. In crossing the river Saale by a boat he said, jestingly, to Jonas: "Dear Doctor Jonas, would it not be a great pleasure to the devil if I, Doctor Martinus, with three sons and with you were to drown?" At the frontier of the territory of the Counts of Mansfeld he was received by one hundred and thirteen horsemen. He felt very weak in the wagon and fainted, but recovered after being rubbed with warm cloths. He remained at Eisleben from January 20th till February 17th, attended to the business of the Counts of Mansfeld, preached four sermons, communed twice, and ordained two ministers "after the apostolic manner." He also confessed and received absolution after the Catholic fashion to which he adhered.*

On the evening before his death he spoke much of death and eternity. After supper he retired to his chamber, followed by his sons Martin and Paul, and by Master Cœlius, and prayed as usual before the window. He complained of pain in the chest. After taking some medicine he slept till ten o'clock. When he awoke he made the odd remark to Dr. Jonas (who had been called to the sick-room) and to Master Cœlius: "Pray for our Lord God and his Gospel, that it may go well with him; for the Council of Trent and the sorry Pope are very angry with him."†

Jonas, Cœlius, the two sons of Luther, his servant Ambrosius and other servants remained with him during the night. He awoke at one o'clock and said to Jonas: "Oh God, I feel so ill. I believe I shall remain here in Eisleben where I was born and baptized." He repeated in Latin the words of Psalm 31 : 5 : "Into thine hand I commend my spirit; Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord, Thou God of truth." He again complained of distress in the chest. Two doctors, Count Albrecht and the countess, and other persons were called to his bedside, and administered medicine. He prayed: "Oh my heavenly Father, God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, thou God of all comfort, I thank Thee that Thou didst reveal thy dear Son Jesus Christ, in whom I believe, whom I have preached and confessed, whom I have loved and praised, whom the Pope and godless people persecute and blaspheme. I pray thee, my Lord Jesus Christ, take care of my poor soul. Heavenly Father, although I must leave this body, I know surely that I shall abide with Thee forever, and that no one can pluck me out of Thy hands." He also repeated in Latin John 3 : 16 : "God so loved the world," etc.

---

* Loosely quoted from Statius, *Thebaid.*, Lib. XII. v. 816 sq.

> "*Nec tu divinam Æneïda tenta,*
> *Sed longe sequere et vestigia semper adora.*"

† "*Wir sind Bettler. Das ist wahr.*" I remember that Dr. Neander was deeply impressed with these words, and wrote them in my album with the addition: "*Theologia crucis, non gloriæ.*"

‡ Walch, Vol. XXI. (Theil II., *Nachlese*, pp. 280-296). Majunke reprinted the report as an alleged *fiction* in his first brochure, and thereby furnished the best refutation of his slander to unprejudiced readers.

* The Lutheran Church retained at first, besides Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as a third of the seven Catholic sacraments, Confession and Absolution. Luther used to confess to Dr. Bugenhagen, his pastor.

† "*Betet für unsern Herrn Gott und sein Evangelium, dass es ihm wohlgehe. Denn das Concilium zu Trent und der leidige Papst zürnen hart mit ihm.*" It should be remembered that the Council of Trent was in session at the time, and ended with an anathema on all the distinctive Protestant doctrines.

(which was one of his favorite passages), and Ps. 68 : 20 : "God is unto us a God of salvation, and unto Jehovah the Lord belong the issues from death."[*]

Cœlius asked him : "Reverend father, will you steadfastly die believing in Christ and the doctrine which you have preached?" Luther replied with an audible "Yea." Then, turning to the right side, he fell asleep never more to awake. He departed peacefully and gently in the Lord, like Simeon.

At four o'clock in the morning the Prince of Anhalt, the Counts of Mansfeld, and other noblemen appeared. A large number of friends and citizens came during the day and shed tears over the body.[†]

On the 19th of February, at two in the afternoon, the body was carried to the Church of St. Andrew with great solemnity. Dr. Jonas preached the funeral sermon on 1 Thess. 4 : 13–18, speaking first of the person and gifts of Dr. Luther, secondly of the resurrection and eternal life.[‡] The corpse was left in the church during the night and watched by ten citizens. Two painters made a copy of the dead face.

On the following day, at noon, after another funeral sermon by Cœlius, the remains were removed in the presence of a great crowd, which accompanied them to the outer gate with many tears and cries. The bells were rung in all the villages through which the funeral procession passed. It arrived in Halle at 8 o'clock, and was received by the pastors, the magistrates, the teachers, schoolchildren, and a crowd of men and women.

On Sunday, the 21st, the procession proceeded to Bitterfeld, and on Monday to Wittenberg. The rector, professors and students of the University, teachers, and magistrates were in waiting to accompany the remains to the castle-church (so famous for the Ninety-Nine Theses which twenty-nine years before had opened the drama of the Reformation). Dr. Pomeranus, his pastor, preached a German funeral sermon before some thousand people, and Melanchthon a Latin oration.[§]

This document bears in every sentence the mark of honesty and accuracy. It proceeds from three respectable scholars, who were personal witnesses. It is throughout consistent with the character of Luther. It is confirmed by all we otherwise know of his last days. It has been accepted by his Protestant biographers, and not been disputed by Catholic writers of note, including Döllinger and Janssen.

To get rid of these witnesses Majunke deliberately declares that they manufactured this report in order to deceive the public and to stop the rumor of Luther's suicide!

4. The funeral sermon of Cœlius, preached at Eisleben on the morning of the 20th of February, 1546, in view of the coffin which contained the remains of Luther, confirms the report of the three witnesses in every essential fact.[*]

According to Majunke, Cœlius must be a double liar. He finds a straw of support in a passage where Cœlius speaks of men who will spread the rumor that Luther was found dead in his bed.[†] Such an apprehension was quite natural, considering the fact that a rumor of that kind had already been propagated before Luther's death. And we learn from a letter of Jonas to Dietrich, dated Halle, March 9th, 1546, that the monks and papists spread the rumor that the coffin of Luther was found empty—that is, that the devil had stolen his corpse.[‡]

5. In addition to these eye-witnesses of well-known reputation we may mention about a dozen less known persons who were present either before or immediately after Luther's death—namely, his two sons, Paul and Martin, his servant Ambrosius, whom he had brought with him from Wittenberg, his host, Hans Albrecht, the town-clerk, two physicians of Eisleben, Count Albrecht of Mansfeld and lady, Count Schwarzburg and lady, three Counts (Philipp, Hans Georg, and Volrath) von Mansfeld. In less than two hours after Luther's death, Justus Jonas sent a report of Luther's death to the Elector of Saxony,[§] and the same courier carried two letters of Count Albrecht of Mansfeld and Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt to the Elector.[‖] Count Hans Georg von Mansfeld informed Duke Moritz of Saxony on the same day that Dr. Luther, after effecting a peaceable settlement between him and his brothers, died a happy Christian death at two

---

[*] In an autograph kept at Rudolstadt, Paul Luther makes special mention of the fact that his father repeated the passage John 3 : 16 three times on his death-bed in his and his brother Martin's presence. See Köstlin, *Martin Luther*, II., 688 (2d edition, 1883).

[†] "*Da haben ihn in dem Sarg liegen sehen viel vom Adel, die ihn mehrentheils gekannt, Mann und Weib, etliche hundert, und ein sehr gross Anzahl Volks.*"

[‡] The sermon is printed in Walch, *l. c.* 363–386.

[§] Both are printed in Walch's edition, *l. c.* 329 sqq. and 342 sqq.

[*] In Walch's edition, vol. xxi. (II. *Nachlese*), 303 329.

[†] "*Es finden sich wie mir fürkommt schon jetzt Leute die durch den bösen Geist getrieben, ausbringen sollen, als habe man ihn im Bette todt gefunden. Nun trage ich nicht Zweifel, der so von Aubeginn ein Lügner ist, wird noch mancherlei mehr und geschwinder Lügen erdenken.*"

[‡] Kawerau, *Briefwechsel des Justus Jonas*, II. 186 : "*Monachi et papistæ finxerunt in feretro Lutheri evanuisse corpus, vacuum huc nos advexisse feretrum.*" Kolde directed Majunke's attention to this letter.

[§] In Kawerau's *Briefwechsel des Justus Jonas*, II., 177 sq.

[‖] Krumhaar, *Grafschaft Mansfeld*, Eisleben, 1855, p. 278. Kolde, *l. c.* 10.

o'clock in the night.[*] There is also extant a private letter of John Aurifaber to Michael Gutt at Halle, written on the 18th of February, to the effect that Luther died between two and three in the preceding night like a good Christian, after having in the evening partaken of a hearty meal in cheerful spirits.[†]

If we consider this array of testimonies, we may well say that there are few men in history about whose last days and departure we have such full and reliable information as about Luther.

All these witnesses are either ignored by Majunke or turned into liars and conspirators, who deliberately concealed the truth and deceived the public !

And what are the witnesses he is able to quote against those liars and conspirators? Only a few malignant papal polemics who wrote thirty or forty years after Luther's death, and who themselves made their assertions merely on vague rumors without a shadow of proof. Such witnesses would be ruled out of any court of justice without a moment's controversy.

Majunke, in the first edition, mentioned as his oldest witness a certain Christophorus Longolius of Cologne, "a theologian held in special estimation by Erasmus," who "in the year of Luther's death" spoke in his *Oratio ad Lutheranos* of a man who perished miserably of a nasty disease contracted by licentiousness.[‡] Kolde (pp. 24 sqq.) proved that this Longolius died September 11th, 1522—twenty-four years before Luther—and alluded to Ulrich von Hutten, who was infected by that disease ! Majunke ignores this correction and repeats the passage of Longolius (in the fourth edition, pp. 15), remarking, by way of excuse, that he did not understand him to charge Luther with licentiousness, but only with intemperance in eating and drinking !

The rumor of Luther's suicide by hanging did not take printed shape and form till 1593, when Thomas Bozius, in a large polemical work, *De Signis Ecclesiæ*, published at Cologne, stated it on the authority of an unnamed servant of Luther, who was at that time a boy and bound by an oath not to divulge the secret, but did divulge it after his return to the Catholic Church.[†] Of such a boy-servant of Luther and his subsequent return to the Catholic Church history knows nothing. Why did Bozius not mention his name? His object was to show that all heretics from Simon Magus down to his own time died a miserable and unnatural death, and after speaking of Luther, he goes on to assert with equal confidence and equal falsification of history that Œcolampadius was strangled, that Calvin died of a complication of horrible diseases, that Bucer was fetched by a fierce demon, who visibly appeared to the terror of the bystanders, slew him, and scattered his entrails in the bedroom ![*] These additions destroy the credit of what he reports of Luther, and are prudently omitted by Majunke.

Nevertheless the story was readily believed and repeated with various amplifications by such Catholic writers as Cornelius a Lapide (1600), who added that Luther was moved to his act by desperation and the fury of a demon, and Cardinal Bellarmin, who knew that the devil distorted the face of Luther.

At last Henricus Sedulius, a Franciscan monk, in a fiercely polemical work against heresies, published at Antwerp, 1606, revealed the true story of Luther's suicide by hanging himself at the bedpost on the ground of a written declaration of a chamber servant of Luther (*cubicularius quidam Martini Lutheri*) to the effect that he carried Luther to his bed in a state of intoxication (*plane obrutus potu*), and found him the next morning strangled at the bedpost; that he was bound by an oath to keep the secret and to spread the report that Luther died suddenly, but that he could no longer resist the power of truth and the voice of conscience.[†] Then Sedulius tells the ridiculous story of the ravens which were summoned by the chief of devils and followed Luther's corpse all the way from Eisleben to Halle and Wittenberg.

But Sedulius never saw that confession, nor does he give the name of the "worthy man" (*dignus vir*) who told him of it while he was at Freiburg in the Breisgau, nor the name of the servant of Luther who made the confession, nor the time when he made it. Such a testimony is absolutely worthless, and with it stands or falls the whole fable of Luther's suicide at the bedpost. No respectable Catholic historian has dared to give it credit.

---

[*] Kawerau, *l. c.* II., 180: "... *ist er* [*Luther*] *diselbige nacht umb zwo uhr christlich, seliglich und wol verschieden und hat also sein leben beschlossen.*"

[†] See the letter in Kolde, *Analecta Lutherana*, p. 427, and in his book against Majunke, p. 11.

[‡] "*Nostis hominem altero crure claudum* .... *morbo qui libidinem ejus obscœnis pustulis indicet, fœde misereque confectum.*" The book of Longolius appeared at Cologne, 1545.

[†] "*Lutherus cum vespere laute cœnasset, ac laetus somno se dedisset, ea nocte suffocatus interiit. Audivi haud ita pridem compertum testimonio sui familiaris, qui tum puer illi serviebat et superioribus annis ad nostros se recepit, Lutherum sibimet ipsi laqueo injecto necem miserrimam attulisse; sed datum protinus cunctis domesticis rei consciis jusjurandum, ne factum divulgarent, ob honorem adjecere Evangelii.*" Lib. XXIII., c. 3, quoted by Majunke, p. 25, and more fully by Kolde, p. 25 sq.

[*] "*Bucero dicunt animam pene agenti astitisse dæmona horrendum, qui cunctos astantes timore exanimarit, a quo ut animam aveheret secum, fuerit perculsus; nam lecto deturbatus effusis per cubiculum passim huc illuc visceribus multisque cruciatibus exanimatus exspirarit.*"

[†] *Præscriptiones adversus Hæreticos*, Ch. XVIII., 25-27. Majunke, p. 95 sq. The book teems with reports of the horrible deaths of heretics. Among other fictions, Sedulius asserts that Œcolampadius was so grieved at Zwingli's death, "*ut paulo post a fœmina, quam incestis polluit nuptiis, in lecto extinctus repertus fuerit.*"

By unearthing this myth of popish ignorance and malice Majunke has elicited a confirmation and propagation of the historical truth concerning the pious departure of the great German Reformer, and unwittingly done good service to the cause of Protestantism.

For The Magazine of Christian Literature.

IS INFANT BAPTISM DECLINING?

BY REV. G. S. BAILEY, D.D., EDITOR OF THE *California Baptist.*

The Magazine of Christian Literature for last October quotes an article on this subject from the *Independent* of New York, August 28th, in which it states, "The *Examiner* and other Baptist papers have frequently said that infant baptism was decaying. It would not at all trouble us if the assertion were true; but we cannot blind our eyes to the fact that it is not true."

The *Independent* then gives reports of the Congregationalists since 1880, in which it says there has been a steady increase, the ratio being now, among Congregationalists, one infant baptism to 55 members annually. Having occasionally given some attention to this subject for forty years past, will you allow me to state a few facts?

The Episcopal Church, from 1841 to 1856, reported one infant baptism for every seven communicants. The Congregationalists now average one to 55 members, or about *one eighth* as many. Do the other *seven eighths* of the infants of Congregationalists go unbaptized? It may be remembered that there was a time in colonial days when Massachusetts parents who neglected to have their infants baptized were arraigned before the court and punished (see Backus's "Church History," p. 95). Infant baptism was then the universal custom of Congregationalists and of all other pedobaptist churches. From statistics gathered forty years ago, I see that the Congregationalists then reported one infant baptism for 47 members. From 1859 to 1865 the average was one to 66, and in 1870 it was one to 72. The *Independent* says the average is now one to 55, while forty years ago it was one to 47. How much increase of ratio in forty years? But the *Independent* says that at present, in Rhode Island and Connecticut, the ratio is about one to 60; in Massachusetts, one to 74; in Vermont, one to 119; in New Hampshire, one to 132; and in Maine, one to 199! Yet New England Congregationalists are supposed to occupy the front rank in biblical scholarship and general intelligence. And here is shown a marvellous decline of infant baptism among them.

The *Independent* gives statistics of other denominations also as to infant baptism. It says the Evangelical Association (German Methodists) report one infant baptism to fourteen and six-tenths, and the Reformed German Church one to thirteen and nine-tenths. This is about half as many as the Episcopalians averaged in 1849.

Twenty years ago four German Methodist conferences reported one infant baptism to eight communicants, or nearly twice as large a ratio as they report now, while five New England Methodist conferences, twenty years ago, reported but one infant baptism to 177 members, or only a twentieth part as large a proportion as the German conferences. Which are the more intelligent biblical scholars, the New England Methodists or the German converts?

The *Independent* says, in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the average is one infant baptism to thirty-three and nine-tenths, and in the Methodist Episcopal Church, North, it is one to thirty and two-tenths. But twenty years ago it was one to 27.

The Old School Presbyterian Church, previous to its union with the New School, reported one infant baptism to 19 members. Now the Presbyterian Church, North, reports less than one to 31; and the Presbyterian Church, South, less than one to 30.

The *New York Recorder* (the predecessor of the *Examiner*) of March 28th, 1849, contains lengthy extracts from an article in the *Churchman* on the decline of infant baptism among the Presbyterians, the writer having been a Presbyterian minister, educated at Princeton, but, because of their neglect of infant baptism, had joined the Episcopalians. He said that, in the leading Presbyteries of Albany, New York, New Brunswick, Baltimore, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and Charleston, the ratio of infant baptisms to membership was one to 25, while in the Episcopal Church the ratio was a little more than one to 5. That Episcopal writer, in 1849, commented on the decline of infant baptism among Presbyterians thus:

"So few already are the infants baptized in the Presbyterian denomination in this country, that it differs but little from a Baptist community, and may, in strict propriety of phrase, be called a semi-Baptist church. The difference between them is that the one excludes all infants indiscriminately from baptism; the other, venturing to discriminate, excludes more than three-fourths. As might have been expected, the Baptists in their position are altogether the stronger of the two. Every Presbyterian minister well knows that even his communicants often acquiesce in infant baptism on vague and insufficient grounds, or are constantly harassed by most painful and perplexing doubts."

But even the Episcopalians who, in 1849, baptized one infant to five communicants, according to the above statement of the *Churchman,* now report but one infant baptism to eight or nine communicants, though the bishop of Illinois, a few years ago, deposed from the ministry Mr. Cheeney, who could not conscientiously call the sprinkled child regenerate.

The present state of infant baptism seems to be about thus: In this country there are about 12,311,000 Protestant church-members, of whom 4,555,000 are Baptists, and those who reject infant baptism, and three-fourths of the remainder, or 5,817,000 others, refuse or neglect to practise it, making 10,372,000 Protestant church-members in this country who do not practise infant baptism, while about 1,939,000, or less than one-sixth of the whole, continue the custom. The decline of infant baptism in this country is amazing and significant.

SOME PLAIN WORDS ON CHRISTIAN LIVING.

Short Sunday Readings.

BY NORMAN MACLEOD, D.D.

From *Good Words* (London), November, 1890.

FIRST SUNDAY.

Read Ps. xxxvii.; Matt. vi. 19–34.

OUR RULE OF LIFE.

It is not unusual, especially at the beginning of the conscious, spiritual life, to ask for definite rules with respect to conduct. "Show us," say some, "what precisely to do and to leave undone. Tell us what amusements are lawful for a Christian and what are unlawful. Draw for us a clear line of separation between a worldly and a holy life. Point out the verse in the Bible which enjoins or prohibits this or that." Speaking generally, we shall search in vain for such guidance. So varied are the circumstances of human life, and so different is our personal liability to temptation and sin, that no rules of this description could have been made equally binding on all. What we do find in Holy Scripture is not an exhaustive catalogue of things forbidden and allowed, but broad, comprehensive principles of action, which it is the function of the Christian conscience, under the direction of the blessed Holy Spirit, who dwelleth "with us" and is "in us," to apply to the ever-changing conditions of our complex life.

Among such principles none is more important or universal than that one which Christ enforced when He said, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness." With reverence, be it said, He *meant* it! These words are more than a fine sentiment. They were earnestly spoken by the Lord of Truth, who is the Lord of man's conscience, our Master and our Exemplar.

To all intents and purposes we treat this saying of Christ more or less as a dead letter. Not this, but the exact opposite, is the rule which many follow, though professing to be animated by Christian motives and principles. "Seek first the things of time and sense, labour for the meat that perisheth, strive with all your might for the secular rewards of industry and ambition; and then, so far as strength or inclination remains, the kingdom of God." But Christ's meaning, however much forgotten or obscured, cannot be evaded. When He said, "Seek God first," He spoke to all ages and to every man. He spoke, moreover, with full knowledge of all that is involved in our relations to the things of this world. He knew how heavy are the burdens of care which men have to carry. It is no ideal life, almost angelic in its unworldliness, which He depicts; rather is it a life spent under the ordinary conditions of existence, such a life as is common to men in a world of constant toil and struggle. We may be sure, therefore, that to be "religious," in the best sense of the word, is faithfully to carry out His grand principle of conduct in all our thoughts and actions.

But we must be careful not to misunderstand Christ. To seek God's kingdom and righteousness is no doubt a phrase which necessarily embraces all the sacred aims of a life "hid with Christ in God"—that life of the Spirit which draws the inspiration of its beauty and power from the vision of a spiritual order of things, which is linked to the eternal and is built up in Him in whom alone any of us can hope to be clothed upon with that "righteousness" which is the fair vesture of saints. There is, however, a wider range of meaning that must not be overlooked. To seek to discover God's will in everything; to obey any of those beautiful laws which He has ordained for the physical and moral well-being of His creatures, is in its own proper sphere to seek the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. We honour this word of Christ when we set the Lord always before us, when we receive all as from His crucified hand, and do all for the furtherance of His glory. It covers the whole field of human interest and activity. When Jesus said, "All these things shall be added unto you," He did not mean, "Attend to nothing but religion, and God will take care that you do not want." He never encouraged sloth or fanaticism. The man who says, "As for me, I devote myself henceforth wholly to praise and prayer and holy meditation, and I depend on God for my daily bread," is not seeking the Kingdom of God and His righteousness in accordance with Christ's intention, inasmuch as he is violating that law of industry and forethought, which is God's law as truly as the most sacred religious duty that could be named. What Christ condemns is not the pursuit of the earthly and temporal, but that all-engrossing worldliness of aim and endeavour which makes self, not God, the end of its striving—which encompasses all thought and labour with its own narrow horizon, and so absorbs the will and the affections that higher things are made secondary and subordinate, instead of being first. The blessing He promises is for the man who trusts God's providence without tempting it; who would rather suffer injury, and even die, than do what he knows to be wrong; who "buys as though he possessed not, and uses the world as not abusing it; because the fashion of this world passeth away." In a word, the lesson is this plain and strong one: that it is not enough to give to God and the things of God a careless thought now and again; that it is not enough to seek God's kingdom and righteousness with a hesitating or divided will, but with the earnest purpose and resolve of men who are seeking as for hidden treasure. "Let those things which are the most important have the first place," is virtually what He says. First let them be in your thoughts and intentions; first in the arrangement of your time; first every day, consecrating common life to God's service; not a secondary consideration which may be pushed aside to make room for every other interest and duty, but the "one thing needful," without which life is unspeakably poor and empty, but with which even the lowliest task and the humblest lot are noble and divine.

Very startling is it sometimes to realize how opposite to all this is our manner of life. A man finds himself pressed for time. Something must be curtailed. In nine instances out of ten the curtailment is on the religious side—Bible reading, secret or family prayer must give way to the more clamant demands of business or pleasure. Or a man becomes suddenly straitened in his worldly means. His profits are declining. He sets himself, most properly, to reduce his expenditure. Too often it is at the House of God that the desired economy is first practised. Charity is stinted. Contributions are diminished, while perhaps luxuries are not less plentiful.

Let no one say, this kind of life is no doubt very beautiful, but it is not possible to realize it. The demands of the world are too imperious for that. It may suit some, but it is not for the busy thousands, who know that "tide and time wait for no man." If this be so, then indeed it is not practicable to be a Christian, not practicable to overcome the world, not practicable to be master of one's own self. But the history of all who have truly followed the sainted footprints of the Master is one long proof that Christ's rule of life is no dream. Men and women like ourselves have done this, and are doing it every day. By the grace of God they have been able to keep the world, with all its allurements and base sophistries, beneath their feet, and to seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness.

And they that seek God shall find Him. On them He will bestow not outward blessings merely, a kingdom and glory in that sense, but Himself, in the all-sufficing fulness of His own infinite perfections. "They shall taste and see that God is good. They shall be abundantly satisfied with the fatness of His house, even of His holy place." But while it is most true that to have found God is to have gained the highest that is possible for the creature, there are other fruits which accompany and follow the practice of this godly habit of living. In ways innumerable and past finding out, there *is* a fulfilment of the promise, "All these things shall be added unto you." How better can we express it than by the old words which have been the song of the Church in the house of her pilgrimage these many days: "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want." "O fear the Lord, ye His saints, for there is no want to them that fear Him." "*No good thing* will He withhold from them that walk uprightly."

SECOND SUNDAY.

Read Ezra iii.; Romans xii.

THE DUTY OF THE DAY IN THE DAY.

We are told that the Israelites, after their return from Babylon, having erected an altar, offered thereon the daily burnt-offering "as the duty of every day required," or as it is rendered in the marginal reading, "They attended to the duty of the day in his day." A moment's reflection should convince us that in the observance of the rule thus incidentally mentioned lies one of the chief secrets of a useful as well as of a happy life.

By acting on this principle it becomes easier to discover *what our duty is.*

It is not difficult to do this if we have regard to the actual circumstances in which we are placed from time to time, that is, if we are sincere and upright, willing to be guided by the hand of Providence, and by the inward teaching of the Holy Ghost. It is when we try to take in a wider horizon, and to fill up large periods of existence, that we become entangled by doubts and misgivings. Then we are too much occupied by the consideration of events which have not arisen, which may never arise, to see our way plainly. We are thinking of to-morrow more than of to-day. We are busied about the fifth or sixth or twentieth step, instead of fixing the mind exclusively on the next step that has to be taken. And so we grow bewildered, and ask impatiently, "In what direction does my duty lie?"

The only way of escape from such perplexity is to live "as the duty of every day requires." You know what your duty is in the present circumstances in which you stand. Suppose you do not; that, as sometimes happens, you see before you two divergent paths, and it is hard to say which is preferable, then we can but bid you remember that word which says, "If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God." Commit thy way unto the Lord, and having done so, depend upon it you will find in the retrospect that there is a Providence

> "Which shapes our ends,
> Rough hew them as we may."

A man, it has been said, seldom or never regrets that step which he has taken after first praying well over the question and then acting according to the best of his judgment.

But allowing for doubtful cases, it is not difficult to discover what our duty is at any particular moment of existence. There may be a thick mist lying on the future, but there is no mist so dense that it is not possible to make sure at least of one step. And if a man does that once, the chances are he will be prepared to do it successfully a second and a third and a fiftieth time. Thus does the path of duty unfold itself before our eyes as we strive to live "as the duty of every day requires." Like the Alpine climber, planting our foot firmly in the step which we have hewn out for ourselves by faith and prayer, we will be prepared for the next step and the next, whatever it is to be. In no case does God show us at a glance the whole course of duty. He does not map out our life plan for us at its commencement. He reveals it step by step as we advance. Our wisdom, therefore, is to live as the duty of every day requires, putting our hand turstfully into the hand of Him who has promised to be our guide even unto death.

The observance of this rule will also save us from much needless misuse *of time and opportunity.*

It is a common experience that our greatest opportunities of service are not those that are sought out by us, or those that are connected with what we may regard as important occasions, but those which spring up as it were by the wayside of life. as so often happened in the earthly history of our blessed Lord Himself. He never went out of His way, so to speak, in order to find opportunities of doing good. He healed the sick, He comforted the sorrowful, He preached the glad tidings "as the duty of every day required." Thus it is casually, accidentally, as it were, that opportunities of doing good come to us. There is, perhaps, no day that does not bring with it some opportunity of doing good that is peculiar to itself. If we are not quick to seize it as it passes it will never come back. Other opportunities of a like kind may arise, but that one never! This is a thought that should constrain us most powerfully to live "as the duty of every day requires." In no other way can we be saved from the misuse of time. In no other way can we make the best of those wonderful opportunities of glorifying God which come to us daily as if on the wing of the fleeting hours, touching us lightly for a moment ere they pass on and away forever.

Further, the observance of this rule will conduce in no small degree to *mental rest and tranquillity of soul.*

There can be no greater unrest than that which springs from the vain attempt to carry the burden of to-morrow, while, on the other hand, it is sweetly restful simply to carry the burden of to-day, whether it be light or heavy. More than half our trouble springs from forgetfulness of this homely rule of life. "We sup sorrow," as the proverb says, "with a long spoon." We make life sadder and darker than it need be by adding to our burden fears and forebodings which may be nothing more than the product of our own imagination. We are not responsible for the future. It is with the present that we have to do. A deep central peace never fails to environ the lives of those who strive to walk humbly and trustfully in the way of duty "day by day." To them is fulfilled, in ways most wonderful and beautiful, that promise in which so many weary pilgrims have found a strong staff to lean on in every time of trouble: "As thy day is so shall thy strength be," "Cast thy burden on the Lord and He shall sustain thee."

"Do not look at life's long sorrow,
See how short each moment's pain,
God will help thee for to-morrow,
Every day begin again."

Once more the observance of this rule is the surest way of attaining *to the grand result of a well-spent life.*

God does not give us our life as a whole to take care of. He metes out to us not three-score years and ten—not one year. He gives us days, and He says to us, "Use these well. Live as the duty of every day requires. Be faithful in the least, and you shall gain the much."

Let us seek then to have our sense of duty—*deepened*, *enlarged*, and *sanctified.*

It is one thing to do one's duty because natural inclination or self-interest prompts to it, another altogether to be faithful and true as the servants of Jesus Christ; to acknowledge God in all our ways, to act in all things great and small as under the eye of our Lord and Master—in a word, to take Christ's yoke upon us and to learn of Him. This, need we say, is to infuse into every duty the same mind that was in Christ. This is to elevate duty from an earthly to a heavenly platform, transfiguring it with a glory like that which irradiated the earthly life of the man Christ Jesus, and finally wreathed His Cross with the splendor of a Divine self-sacrifice. Would we know what fidelity to duty is? How noble are its sacrifices, its victories, its rewards? Then must we learn that lesson not only from the example of those who in days gone by have been faithful unto God, but, above all, from the life and death of Him who alone of all who have trod the path of duty could say, without fear and without shame, when the end came, "I have glorified Thee, O Father; I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do!"

THIRD SUNDAY.

Read Isaiah xlii.; Galatians vi.

DISCOURAGEMENT.

That is a striking word which is applied to the Servant of the Lord, "He shall not fail nor be *discouraged*, till He have set judgment in the earth; and the isles shall wait for His law."

He shall not be discouraged!

It is the same word that is used in the immediately preceding verse of the bruised reed. He shall not be "broken"—broken by disappointment, broken by the sense of failure. Never, surely, was there a servant of the Lord who had so much to discourage him as Jesus Christ. "He was despised and rejected of men." Judged by the ordinary standards of success His was a work on which the word "failure" was most plainly written. But He was *not* discouraged. He had faith in God and in His own mission. He never doubted that in the end His cause would triumph. He never despaired of that final issue of events that was guaranteed by Jehovah's covenant promise—and He could wait!

And thus it is, or ought to be, in the experience of all God's true servants. "I have never known a case," says one of the most honoured of living workers, "when God used a discouraged man or woman to accomplish any great thing for Him." Everything, therefore, which is calculated to inspire us with courage as Christian workers, should be assiduously cultivated. Discouraged we often are, but discouraged we would never be, if like Him who, for "the joy that was set before Him, endured the cross," we could anticipate with clear prevision the glorious predestined end of all our labours and sacrifices. We would then perceive that even the lowliest task, well performed, is a contribution made to that grand result which is to be accomplished in the fulness of time—a little rill which swells the tide of that mighty river of life which is one day to encircle the whole earth.

True there is a sense in which discouragement is in no respect blameworthy. It is only human to be conscious sometimes of flagging powers and exhausted energies. This may be felt even in the work of our personal salvation. It is so hard to maintain the daily struggle against sin—to be true and pure and Christlike. Still more deeply, however, is this painful sense of discouragement experienced in connection with such efforts as may be described by the general name of "well-doing." There are some, of course, who grow weary simply because their heart was never in their work. Perhaps they were induced to undertake it through a sudden impulse, or in response to the appeal of their clergyman, without moral earnestness, or genuine consecration of their own selves to Christ. No wonder that interest is speedily dissipated, and irksome duties relinquished. There is that discouragement, too, which has its root in causes which are almost childish, like a supposed want of appreciation, or some trifling irritation which is nothing more or less than wounded vanity. The so-called discouragement which springs from such petty feelings is unworthy of being noticed.

Not without a true sympathy, however, would we desire to meet the case of those whose weariness is not beneath the notice of our Great High Priest. In many instances it arises from a low tone of spiritual life. Perhaps it is some subtle form of unbelief that has paralyzed us for the moment. No man can do successful work for God if he has lost inward vigor. In the same degree as we give way to doubt or uncertainty, and suffer our love to grow cold, we must be weakened in Christian service. Once we lose firm hold of God, and Christ, and immortality, and begin to play "fast and loose" with the warnings and promises of Revelation, there is an end to all joyous activity in the work given us to do. In all ages God has used those who were in earnest, and there can be no earnestness where there is no conviction. We cannot minister before the Lord with the unction of the Holy One if that unction is not upon us. When we probe the matter to the bottom, probably we shall find at the very outset of our search that for the discouragement of which we complain we are ourselves to blame. We may have been living at a distance from God, or have fallen back into careless and worldly ways. The lamp may be burning low, simply because the oil is running out. In any case, to have discovered the cause is to have found the remedy. The first step toward being delivered from that sense of weariness which so often discourages us in work for others, is to seek spiritual quickening and renewal from God Himself, that our fainting souls may be revived and our soiled faces cheered.

Is it difficulty which discourages us? There are countless hindrances which must be faced by all who undertake any part of God's work in this world. It needs patience, self-control, even irksome and apparently unavailing toil. But who ever promised an easy "march over" to the soldiers of the Cross? We may find it hard to teach a class of unruly or unmannerly children, or to visit the dismal abodes of sin and shame. Be it so. He who would follow the bleeding feet of his crucified Lord must be prepared "to endure hardness."

But possibly the discouragement which enfeebles is connected not so much with the painfulness of service as with its seeming unfruitfulness. You attempt to reclaim some dark spot of the moral wilderness which lies around you. You enter one of those miserable haunts of human crime and misery which are to be found in every corner of the land. You try to make it purer, brighter and happier, to lighten the heavy burdens of care and poverty, to give courage to the desponding, to point the sinful to the Lamb of God, to lead weary wanderers home. In vain you cry. Nothing seems to come of it! As far as you can judge you are adopting the right methods. And yet there is no visible result. No heart is touched; no trophy laid at the feet of Jesus.

To those whose experience at all corresponds with this description, we would say, with all tenderness, Be not discouraged! There is nothing new to be said. Two considerations, however, must be reiterated. One is that the like has happened in the history of God's noblest servants. Holy prophets and apostles have cried, "Who hath believed our report?" All through the ages has that mournful cry been ascending unto God from wearied toilers in the great harvest field. Another thought, trite in one sense, though too often forgotten, is that in the spiritual as in the natural world, seed-time and harvest are not the same. In numerous instances the discouragement which arises from an alleged want of success, is but another name for that impatience that would grasp results without waiting for the slow progress of events by which alone they can be reached. "In due season ye shall reap, if ye faint not," says the apostle. Men will do much for uncertain results; they will sow fields they may never reap; they will labour for gains they may never enjoy. But there is no uncertainty here. In due season God *will* give the increase according to His own eternal law of seedtime and harvest.

"Love soweth *here* with toil and tears,
But the harvest time of love is *there*."

FOURTH SUNDAY.

Read Isaiah lx. ; Phil. iv.

A LESSON OF CHEERFULNESS.

"Rejoice in the Word alway, and again I say rejoice. Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand. Be careful for nothing ; but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God which passeth all understanding shall keep your hearts and minds, through Jesus Christ."

There is a real, though perhaps to a superficial reader, an invisible thread of connection, which makes these verses practically one exhortation.

We have called it a lesson of Christian cheerfulness. Not that cheerfulness which is only a superficial sparkle on the surface of men's lives, hiding away the sleepless cares which lurk beneath, but that cheerfulness which is but another name for a conscience at peace with itself, and a heart that has found its true resting-place in the bosom of God. After all, the characteristic spirit of the religious life is joy. "Rejoice in the Lord alway," cries the suffering apostle to suffering men and women. I have said it already ; again I will say it, "Rejoice !" This joy he evidently regarded not less as a privilege than as a duty ; a grace to be assiduously cultivated and habitually practised. How little do we think of this ! Few things reveal the shallowness of our religion more than the joylessness which as a rule pervades it. Something there must be that hinders the full tide of the peace of Christ from flowing in and filling every creek and crevice of our lives. How shall we account for the absence of that heart happiness which no sorrow can wholly destroy, that abiding restfulness and serenity of mind which shines down upon us in the radiant promise of the Gospel, "Peace I leave with you. My peace I give unto you"?

Many answers might be given. Meanwhile two may suffice. Both are suggested by the apostle's words, which seem designed to set before us the conditions of spirit under which Christian joy may be increasingly realized.

First. Let your moderation be known unto all men—your forbearance or gentleness is more strictly accurate. It is a comprehensive word in which there are subtle shades of meaning not easily expressed. It describes the disposition which if need be "willingly surrenders," as one has tersely put it, "the assertion of legal rights lest they should be pushed into moral wrongs." Negatively it is to be not contentious or self-assertive. Positively it is to be examples of that charity "which seeketh not her own, which is not easily provoked, which beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things."

In a word, to use the modern phrase. it is that "sweet reasonableness" which conduces, more than aught else that could be named, to the formation of the soil out of which joy springs and blossoms and bears fruit.

Not less is joy hindered by the absence of moderation in the usual sense of the word. By nothing is it more surely banished than by the entrance of those evil passions which we call worldliness, covetousness, unsanctified ambition, the love of gain, the lust of accumulation. Like force, joy ever acts along the line of the least resistance. Would we possess it as the inmate of the soul, then must we submit ourselves to the conditions of its blessed manifestation and heavenly power. Let us be humble, gentle, meek. Let us be merciful and forgiving, unselfish and unworldly, remembering that God is Himself our chief good, that the Creator is greater than the creature, the Giver than all His gifts—that to have a good conscience, a quiet mind, and a holy life, is greater treasure than the world with all its fading glitter can bestow upon us.

Again, Christian cheerfulness cannot co-exist with that "over anxiety" which so often proves its greatest disturber and hinderer.

When St. Paul bade the Christians at Philippi to be over-anxious about nothing, but to carry all their sorrows and their fears to the throne of Jesus, he taught them a lesson which is for all ages, and was never more needed than in this age of hurry and distraction on which our lot has fallen. Infinitely varied as are the cares and anxieties, the vain regrets and dark forebodings, with which our web of life is woven, there is no man so burdened that he cannot find in that one word of inspiration, the secret of a peace which "passeth all understanding." Moments indeed there are when it seems of all things the most useless to attempt to produce in ourselves or others that sweet tranquillity of mind which is here recommended—even that meek and quiet spirit which in the sight of God is of great price. But in the light of nineteen centuries of Christian lives and Christian deaths, it cannot surely be affirmed that it is only a pious fancy to speak of peace guarding heart and mind, despite the ever-varying conditions of trial which exist in this world. Such a thing has been. Such a thing now is. Wherever there is a heart that trusts God with a true childlike faith; wherever there is the voice of prayer uttering itself forth in real petitions to Him who knows all that we desire, *there* is peace, and there the joy which is unutterable and full of glory.

FIFTH SUNDAY.

Read Mal. iii.; Luke xxiv. 13-32.

RELIGIOUS CONVERSATION.

How touching is the thought of that little company of unknown worshippers who, in the days of Malachi, feared the Lord, and thought upon His name! How unspeakable is the tenderness with which God regarded them! What greater comfort could we have than to be reminded, in a manner so truly wonderful, that His eye is upon all His people; that He never forgets them, but "writes" their poor, broken, faltering words in the "Book of His remembrance," that they are indeed most dear to Him, His "jewels," His peculiar "treasure," bought at a great price, even by the precious blood of Christ! When one remembers times in this world's history when the light of the Gospel was well-nigh quenched; when one thinks of many a "little flock" meeting together for the worship of God in the midst of heathendom, or of lonely Christians maintaining their faith unshaken in circumstances the most adverse; how cheering it is to recall the memory of those ancient believers, who, in the dark days of Malachi, were true to God and to one another, albeit their lot was cast in the midst of a "sinful and perverse generation."

"They spake often one to another."—As a rule it cannot be said that *we* speak often one to another concerning those things which ought to be of deepest interest to us—which must be of deepest interest one day, when we stand on the solemn frontier land of eternity! To some extent, no doubt, this is the result of natural and constitutional temperament. Religious feelings manifest themselves differently in the case of different individuals. It has been remarked by an acute observer, with reference to Scotchmen, that "while they may discuss sometimes readily enough their religious opinions, very few indeed who have lived chiefly in their own country are inclined to enter with a stranger into the more sacred region of emotion and experience; indeed, that when a Scotchman is very ready to unfold his religious feelings to a stranger, there is *primâ facie* reason for a little suspicion about his sincerity." The same remark might, perhaps, admit of a wider application. The religious diversities which exist among Christians, even within the same family circle, are almost infinite. As there is room in the Church of God for the gentleness of a John as well as for the ardour of a Peter; for the "practical" Martha as well as for the "contemplative" Mary; so, too, for the timid and reserved, who only "think" with reverent love upon the name of God, as well as for the more demonstrative, who speak aloud His praises. No mistake could be greater than to suppose that those who are not in the habit of expressing their feelings on religious matters are of necessity less religious than those whose nature is more emotional. Who has not known Christian men and women, in all classes of society, of whose "life in God" we had no doubt, and of whose salvation through Christ, now that they are gone, we feel as sure as of our own existence, though possibly we can hardly recall a word they ever said with reference to their soul's experience? They were "living epistles, seen and read of all men."

Nor can it be denied that there is such a thing as the abuse of this great privilege of Christian converse. Much harm is often done by an unwise attempt to force what is called "religious conversation" on others, without regard to time, place, or circumstances.

But this is not the extreme into which most of us are in the greatest danger of falling. Over-reticence rather than over-demonstrativeness is our chief fault. Depend upon it, a little more frankness between parents and children, between brothers and sisters, between companions and friends, between pastor and people, would be a great good to many. The conversation of those who profess religion may easily degenerate, and often does, into mere talk; but when it is humble, seasonable, and wise, it is one of God's "ordinances," which He will honour with His blessing. Take the pastoral relationship, for example. What a much more definite and practical thing preaching would become if the preacher knew, instead of merely guessing, what are the individual wants and difficulties of his hearers! There is no servant of Christ worthy of the name who is not deeply thankful for any opportunity of becoming acquainted with the "inner life" of those whose spiritual interests have been committed to his charge. That such opportunities should occur so rarely is, alas! one of the many proofs of the "low estate" into which we are fallen. Think, again, what a sense of loneliness there often is in the experience of Christian souls! What an unsatisfied yearning for help and sympathy! What sore burdens of doubt, sorrow, and perplexity are often carried in secret for months, or it may be for years, which a few words of wise counsel or kindly sympathy might alleviate or remove! How many are now struggling along the wearisome road appointed them, as if they were alone, who might thus be comforted by the joy of companionship, cheered by the songs of fellow-pilgrims on the heavenward journey!

It may be said, "We have Christ to go to, and He will give us all we need." That is so. We readily acknowledge that no effectual succour can be derived from any other quarter. The two disciples on their way to Emmaus "communed together," but it was not until "Jesus Himself drew near" that their sadness was turned into joy. Their "communing" was nevertheless the occasion and opportunity of that marvellously beautiful manifestation of His risen life which followed. And so, too, there are occasions ever recurring when we need solace and encouragement from others. Are we not one Body? Why, then, should we sink down into the position of mere units? Are we not the Household of God? Why should we be as strangers and foreigners to one another? "Come," says the Psalmist, "all ye *that fear God*, and I will declare what He hath done for my soul." "Go home to thy *friends*," said Jesus to the healed demoniac of Gadara, "and *tell them* what great things the Lord hath done for thee." Let us, therefore, "comfort one another," and "edify one another." Let us not forget that "a man hath joy by the answer of his mouth; and a word spoken in season, how good is it!"

"I have known one word hang starlike
O'er a dreary waste of years,
And it only shone the brighter
Looked at through a mist of tears.
While a weary wanderer gathered
Hope and heart on life's dark way,
By its faithful promise shining
Clearer day by day."

CATHERINE BOOTH.

BY JOSEPHINE BUTLER.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), November, 1890.

When a bright star at which we have been gazing is suddenly overclouded there is a momentary sense of dazzled bewilderment. At the closing in of a brilliant life, and the disappearance from among us of a remarkable personage, it seems better to hold one's breath, and wait for awhile before attempting to measure in words the full meaning of the character, the call, and the teaching of the life which has ceased, as we suppose, for this world. The last affecting and tender words of the Mother of the Salvation Army, while passing over Jordan, are yet too vividly before our minds, —the picture given (ideally sweet and full of triumph) of her farewell to her family and friends is too prominent in our memory, to allow us to trace with perfect calmness of judgment the bearing of her life and work on the future, or to estimate adequately the effect on the world of the past years of her labors. What can be said, for the present, more than has been said? For myself I can only record a few of the impressions which I have received during the rare personal interviews which I have had with Mrs. Booth. It would not be worth while to say anything at second-hand, nor can I do so. The impressions given at first-hand are few and imperfect; but such as they are, they may be interesting to some who loved her, and to the many who still inquire, hopefully or critically, concerning the character and work of the Salvation Army.

Of the points which have struck me most in connection with the Mother of the Salvation Army, the first is the Family Idea, as illustrated in her own household and throughout the organization which she guided. The Family—the foundation-stone of society, the most sacred of human institutions, to which Jehovah has given the sanction of his own name, calling himself "The God of the families of the whole earth"—this ideal constantly needs to be revived and fortified. In order to revive and consecrate in an especial manner before the whole world the idea of the Family, Mrs. Booth must have been specially fitted, and was so, by her own singular felicity and distinguished success as a wife and mother. It would seem that this marriage was made, indeed, and this family planned in Heaven, for the carrying out of a great work. All the Booth children have inherited the unprecedented energy, the intellectual activity, and the large-heartedness of both parents. Mrs. Booth, we are told, was a model mother; at once firm and loving. She trained her children in the fear of God, and in the early sense of responsibility toward their fellow-creatures. The family is remarkable for the united intensity of purpose gathered up in, and flowing forth from it;

for its oneness of heart and judgment in the pursuit of a single great object.

But while the Booth family owes incalculably to its maternal head, on the other hand it probably owes something to the very existence and influence of the Army which it itself has formed. It is imaginable that, apart from this sublime and engrossing work, with all its ramifications, carried on with undying enthusiasm, devotion, daring, and everything which belongs to a life and death conflict, the energy of this gifted family might have been found an inconvenience to itself; even an element of discord. With the marked individuality and strong personal feelings of all its members, under circumstances of comparative inactivity and lack of an all-engrossing interest, they might have rubbed with sharp angles against each other, trod on each other's toes, found grave differences of opinion arising, and so might have separated—each, no doubt, to do some stern and useful work, but not showing the unbroken front of the family as a power for good. As we all know, a most helpful element in family life is created, and a great incentive is given to brotherly affection and unity, when the entire family answers a call to some useful and great work, which claims its whole energies. The strengthening and extension of the family idea in and by the Salvation Army itself presents a unique picture in the history of the world. Great religious societies and movements have generally, till now, been formed on the denial, more or less, of the ties of natural affection; and those which have admitted the co-operation of women have admitted it only in a very subordinate capacity. The family life of the Salvation Army has struck me greatly, and affected me deeply, from time to time when I have been brought into working contact with them, on the Continent or at home, in movements connected with legislative or social reform, with which they have ever been warm sympathizers. Their officers and soldiers exercise strict and sometimes bitter self-denial; they have many hardships and trials; nevertheless, they have the great joy and comfort of forming one vast family. The whole huge organization beats with one great pulse of warm family life—of brotherhood and sisterhood. As it has been remarked, marriage is encouraged, rather than the reverse, among them; there is a beautiful frankness about their courtships and betrothals; their weddings are public solemnities, and their happiness in these family unions for salvation work is in a pleasant manner even paraded in public. Family life is certainly made attractive to the masses by their means. They cannot be reproached with any neglect of domestic duties, the loving ties of motherhood, etc., while at the same time they continue unceasingly the great common work. Old men and maidens, young men and children are alike drawn into the mighty stream which bears them onward; a place is found for each, and their work is only arrested by sickness or death, except in the rare cases in which a decided distaste or unfitness for the career develops itself. But besides the family life within themselves, they offer a *home* atmosphere and loving reception to the outcasts of the world. The miserables of our cities, whom it is their great aim to reach, have few wholesome joys, rarely any family life which is worthy of the name, and few resorts where they can relax or have anything like real and blameless social intercourse; but all these things the Booth family have discovered a way of providing for them. Miss Marsh tells a story of a poor, ignorant navvy, whom she asked to give his idea of heaven; he replied, "A kitchen with a good fire, a man with a fiddle, and a dance on the nicely sanded floor." It is in human nature to desire society and relaxation, and if these cannot be found of a good kind, people will take what they can get, and it seems like heaven to them, even if it be of the worst. We all long for periods when the blood is warmed and the countenance sharpened by intercourse with other human beings, when the burdens of life can be forgotten for at least half an hour. Few of our comfortably housed and fastidious people know the value of these lively, well lighted meetings which are so constantly held by the Salvation Army. Go into one of them on a raw winter night, and you will scarcely fail to see that there is here a blessed resort for the most wretched of every kind. Here is cheerfulness—you can have noise if you like—music, singing, and happy faces, earnest loving hearts, and affectionate hands held out to every comer, irrespective of character or appearance. And in the midst of the throng stands the Divine Being, whose presence is invoked continually, to convert, comfort, heal and bless. These traps, which happily catch poor souls by thousands, may not be pointed or adorned in a fashion to suit the taste of the "better classes," but they answer their purpose, and, caught in these traps, the wretched multitude are aided, elevated, and, in Army language, "Saved." No wonder they linger, as we see them linger, about the doors of these bright and hospitable buildings, and no wonder that many feel they have for the first time understood the meaning of the word "home."

Secondly, the power of a righteous anger is illustrated in the character of Mrs. Booth. It marks a most imperfect appreciation of the grandeur of Christ and his teaching, when the attributes of "gentleness and meekness" are exclusively cited as his greatest characteristics. Some of us have suffered not a little during our humble efforts to undo some social wrong, from the dead weight of passive opposition offered by charitable persons who take this one-sided view of the religion of Christ. Painfully and awfully conscious ourselves of the presence of a malignity in the world which though spiritual in its origin becomes incarnate in man, we are driven to doubt the nature of the Christian experience, which results only in reiterated cautions and rebukes, such as, "We must believe that the persons with whom you are so indignant were actuated by good motives; it is wrong to impute bad motives; their views may differ from yours, but certainly their intentions are pure and good."

Do we sufficiently acknowledge, even now after the sharp experience of recent years, not only the value but the necessity of the mighty working of a holy anger? Mrs. Booth wielded this weapon to some purpose. It was instinctive in her to be incensed against injustice and wrong; and it was not only in her the sanctified human wrath, but the *woman's* wrath,—that most terrible weapon of which the God of Love avails himself for the crushing of the false and the base in some of the most desperate and vital controversies of life. I have been with her, face to face, when we had joined hands against certain abominations of the "dark places of the earth, wherein are the habitations of cruelty." She was instinctively aware that such things were. She had become early in life conscious of the power of evil in the world. She knew that the devil, as a roaring lion, goes about seeking whom he may devour; that he devours by thousands the ignorant, the helpless and the weak. She knew also, that in order to carry out his plans, he takes up his abode in the persons of certain human beings who become his tools: that these Satanically possessed (not ordinary madmen, for they are sometimes highly respectable and refined persons with every advantage of education and position) are the representatives on earth of the malign power, by whatever name we may call it, which we are bound to hate with a "perfect hatred." This feeling is compatible with the most ardent desire for the deliverance of the agents of evil, and their release from spiritual bondage. I recollect the little clenched hand, and the angry fire that shot through those kind and intelligent eyes when we spoke of the sufferings and the wrongs that proceeded from the spirits of tyranny, oppression, cruelty and savage lust. The holy wrath of Christ is a mighty power, living and burning in the same breast with all His gentleness, and all the long-suffering and patience of the saint, so far as self is concerned. But it is only those who have entered the Inner Sanctuary, who have learned their great lessons in the intimate presence of God, who can wisely or safely exercise this power of anger. Only one who is filled with the love of God and man can effectually pour forth vials of wrath upon the tyrants and oppressors, upon the Governments and rulers and slaves by whose means the kingdom of Satan is being advanced upon earth. It seems to me that this holy indignation wrought in this woman with a power second only to that of the mighty love of God and of men's souls which possessed her.

It was some fifteen years ago that, observing from the *War Cry* (then in its infancy I suppose) the advancing wave of this movement, I wrote to Mrs. Booth, as one woman to another, on the subject of the outrage on justice and our own sex which had been perpetrated by the Legislature in providing for the regulation of vice. Her letters in reply were striking. She was filled with the deep sorrow which a true woman feels on the subject, first on behalf of womanhood, and secondly in contemplation of the degrading effect on the whole nation which had permitted in its midst so cruel a practice founded on so base a principle. Indeed, I believe that at no period of her life did her natural qualities as a leader of thought and action appear more conspicuously than in relation to this business. Her womanly insight and highly strung moral feeling made her comprehend at a glance the national danger incurred by this legislative compact with moral laxity, and the degradation of her entire sex by the arbitrary selection and legal shackling of a few. So vividly did she realize the situation, and so keenly did she resent it, that she told me her health was impaired by it. She was too advanced on this subject at the outset even for her husband, aggressive and uncompromising as he has always been against evil, public and private. And as this episode forced upon Mrs. Booth the fact that even the best of men do not always instinctively discern the right in regard to women's interests, the painfulness of the situation became more intense to her, and every faculty of her mind was strained to understand how any religious leader could have any sort of doubt on such a question. Of course, under the stimulating influence of so strong and true a nature, the General very quickly came to see eye to eye with his wife.

Mrs. Booth had a remarkable completeness of character. I say this in face of the opinion of many that she was one-sided. I do not refer here to her religious teaching; the completeness I speak of is that of a human being, of a woman. She was a most tender wife, with feelings of deep reverence toward her husband, referring everything to his judgment, and anxiously solicitous to please him. The universal testimony of her children is that she was an ideal mother, and —what is more rare—a successful one, in the training of her family. She was a shrewd judge of human nature; a woman of varied information and wide sympathy. Her interest in her early life in the Anti-Slavery question, her intense sympathy with our later Abolitionist and Purity movement, her fiery public and private protests against vivisection, were striking instances of this. She was also deeply interested in the treatment of prisoners and of lunatics, especially the latter. All questions affecting the rights of women and children had a fascination for her, and her sense of justice led her to feel deeply the wrongs suffered by the voiceless and unrepresented portion of the people. It is hardly necessary to say that she believed it just that women should have the Parliamentary vote. She made an earnest and an exhaustive investigation of the compulsory vaccination delusion. She loved the people; her attitude and that of her husband toward them has always been a reflection of the infinite pity of the heart of Christ, exemplified in the words, "I have compassion on the multitude . . . . because they have nothing to eat." This was no fitful sentiment of compassion, but an enduring feeling, and its fruitfulness will be, I believe, strikingly proved in the practical carrying out, which we now await with almost breathless interest, of the great scheme put forth by General Booth. This scheme is in a certain sense the outcome of the union of two great hearts and minds. On political and social questions Mrs. Booth's opinions were more than opinions; they were convictions. Long before any other members of her family had done more than give a passing glance at the great questions of land reform, the laws affecting the drink traffic, etc., she had read all that was current on those questions, formed her own views, and helped in a great measure to form the opinions of many of her friends. I have spoken of her indignation against wrong; when possessed of this feeling she would rise to the attitude of the old Hebrew prophets, sorrowful and compassionate, but terrible in denunciation. To her the Bible was simply the Word of God. She felt a contempt for those educated people who tear that Word to pieces, or cast it aside, in order to meet the supposed exigencies of modern thought. She apparently herself found in it all that she required for her own needs and for her far-seeing plans for the progress of humanity. Apologies for the Almighty, and His recently discovered little blunders, excited her utmost contempt, her most withering scorn. She was a stern critic and a hearty hater.

As a public speaker, her chief success seems to have been in her reasoning power —her logic—which never failed her even in her most indignant sallies. I recall the nervous and suffering look with which she often rose to address vast audiences in St. James's or Exeter Hall. The low tone in which she began her address, something of diffidence in her attitude, and of tremor in her voice, surprised those who heard her for the first time; but they had only to wait a few moments for the fire to burn and flash which consumed all that was accidental, and overcame all physical weakness. She was an effective speaker from the purely oratorical point of view, and was easily able to appeal at pleasure to the emotional element in her audience. Yet this declamatory power was not her chief force in speaking; that lay far more in her exceptional reasoning faculty and the fervour of her loving soul. Even those who disagreed with what she said could not but be compelled to acknowledge her power over the mind and conscience of her hearers. I happened to meet Mr. Froude shortly after he had attended some of her lectures bearing on social and national subjects; he spoke of having been greatly struck by her strength of judgment, her penetration, her shrewd common-sense, and the absolute truth and honesty of her character, as well as her intellectual acuteness. Like John Wesley, she was pre-eminently a preacher of righteousness. I should say she gave the chief place in her preaching to the old-fashioned, almost Puritanical righteousness, insisting on the folly and dishonesty of any divorce of faith and works. It was to her a great beacon of truth in the latter-day darkness, that a perfect obedience was as much required of the children of God at this day as under the old Dispensation. As a private adviser, her shrewd insight into the heart of any disputed matter brought many to ask her counsel for the adjustment of delicate and difficult questions. One of her sons writes to me: "She had an extraordinarily fine and delicate nature; always nervous and timid. Up to the very last she shrank from public work, and was generally utterly prostrated after speaking or preaching. It was only under the pressure of extreme conviction that she could speak at all. She continually suffered intensely in the contemplation of the poverty and misery of the people. In the early days of the Army, before it began to have any great success, a drive through the City of London would upset her for a week." This brings to my recollection a visit to the family at Clapton, where Mrs. Booth was suffering greatly in health. She had an engagement to speak at some immense meeting that same evening, and in a half pathetic, half humorous tone she begged of her daughters to *make* her go to bed, with a hot bottle at her feet, and to try and ensure her a few hours of sleep, so that she might be able to stand up on the platform in the evening, and give the message with which God might entrust her.

Thirdly. Her political insight was unusual. She was an able exponent of the political and social meanings of the movement she guided. At one of the Annual Sessions of the Friends, at Devonshire House, Bishopsgate-street Without, Mrs. Booth gave, by request, a remarkable address, which appears never to have been published, though it deserved to be preserved. She held her great audience, of Friends and others, in breathless interest, while she spoke of the inspiration and origin of the movement, and pleaded in defence of some of the Army's extraordinary methods. But most impressive of all was her prophetic sketch of the coming times; the advance of Socialism, the onward rush of combined efforts, in good and evil, and the volcanic elements at work in our London, where misery and wrong were sowing the seeds of revolution. She drew a graphic and awful picture of "Underground London," of the character and appearance of that lowest stratum which some rare event from time to time brings to the surface of our streets, a mass of creatures hardly human, debased through generations of misery, and ignorance, and vice, full of hatred—hatred of society and of everything which exists; wild beasts ready for vengeance. These were a political and social danger of which our Governments, of whatever party, were not then at all aware, nor had they even the means of testing its existence. We were living, she said, on a volcano; at the edge of a mine of moral dynamite. Then came the question: "What is to be done?"—a question which has been unceasingly asked since then, and is now, in the dawn of a brighter day, beginning, we believe, to be answered. Her penetration and sympathy enabled her to feel the pulse of this seething mass of suffering, sullen, and enraged humanity, to understand its woes, and to judge, in some measure, of the remedies that must be brought to bear upon it at once, and in the future. The wish was expressed in that hall that every member of the Government, and our wisest public men, could have been brought under the impression which was there given, and could have taken to heart the truths exposed. She spoke as a Seer, and events have justified her prophesying. In face of the view there presented to us, how shallow seemed the criticisms of certain fastidious portions of society, when inveighing against the vulgarity of the methods by which the Salvation Army reaches down and draws up recruits from this low stratum, and calls out teachers of righteousness from that mass of sullen, reckless humanity! It seems a short-sighted folly, from a political and social point of view, apart from the spiritual side of the subject, for men to find fault with any lawful methods used to purify these moral sewers which are poisoning the whole atmosphere, above and around. Let us hope that this kind of criticism is about to become extinct. Mrs. Booth drew examples from the history of the ancient Jews in their worst times. The ears of that people were deaf to the ordinary religious teaching in their own times of national misery, and then prophets were divinely elected to call them back to their right mind, sometimes by methods not less *bizarre* than those invented or tolerated by the Booth family. She drew a smile from her audience by her quaint description of Ezekiel, who was absolutely commanded, as she said, by God to act in a manner which would nowadays be called "making a fool of himself" for the salvation of the people. Words were not enough; he must act the message in his own person; so he was commanded to take an iron pan, and set it in front of him, and lie on his right side on the ground for so many days, and again on his left side for another period of days, while uttering his word of warning. Certain people would then gather round him. No doubt they wondered what this madman was doing; yet their dulled imaginations and hearts were reached by this somewhat ghastly pictorial message when nothing else would suffice. Mrs. Booth concluded by saying that certainly she and her family had never done anything so objectionable as this.

From the beginning of the movement, the Booths have taught that the salvation of the world must begin with that of the individual; that a man here and a woman there must be turned round and got to go on the right road, and at once set out on the work of saving others; that the people must be their own saviours, evangelists to their own class. They were firmly rooted in the great doctrine that God has made the true progress of the human race to depend on the awakening of the individual soul;—a doctrine which has been held by all great religious teachers. We have most of us seen some instance of an individual, perhaps a solitary sufferer in a slum, converted to God and to righteousness in the midst of the most wretched circumstances and surroundings, and becoming an influence like that of a spring of clear water in the midst of a fœtid marsh. But these cases are comparatively rare. Modern evangelists and saviours of the people are finding their efforts arrested at a stratum of society in which the awakening of the heart and conscience, resulting in a change of life, becomes practically an impossibility, owing to the material conditions of the life of those they seek to save. Mr. H. P. Hughes says that he has never seen a hungry man converted. You must play the part of the Good Samaritan—feed and help materially, first, and then speak to the soul. In that great typical act, the raising of Lazarus, our Lord himself required the removal of an outward impediment. "Take ye away the stone," he said, the heavy slab which imprisoned the body of Lazarus. It was only after the removal by the hands of his servants around him of that impediment, that he pronounced with a loud voice the words, "Lazarus, come forth!" Our perishing populations in our great cities are buried, battened down as it were, under the stony pressure of the wretched material circumstances of their lives, dark, crushed, hopeless. The words spiritually uttered, "Come forth," do not, cannot reach that buried mass of people; the heavy gravestone must be lifted away, and for this gigantic task thousands of united forces are required. This weight must be bravely lifted, and carted clean away before the light of heaven and the resurrection voice can reach the buried souls beneath. It is interesting to observe how the leaders of the Salvation Army have profited by experience, "solving in working." Their own earnestness and genius, and the progress and growth of their work, have lifted them to a position of high responsibility, in which the eyes of the world are upon them. They feel their responsibility; they do not work in a narrow groove; they refuse no suggestion from any side; they take large and wide views of human nature and the conditions of modern life. They have learned statesmanship in a remarkable degree, and they have able men among them who are worthy to rank among the shrewdest statesmen of our times. This experience, this knowledge and statesmanship, are now being brought to bear upon the great problem of modern life, the "social question."

Fourthly. The great question of the status of women has been in some degree solved by Mrs. Booth's existence. It seems scarcely necessary to dwell upon the influence which her life and work have had upon the question of the capabilities of women. It is a marvellous and a pleasant thing to observe how great a portion of our unemployed womanhood—that surplus womanhood whose existence was for so many years a perplexity and a grief to us—has been absorbed by the great organization of the Salvation Army. Not only have they been personally saved, and set to work to help others, but they have undergone a training which only requires one to look a little closely into the individual characters of the female portion of the organization to force one to pronounce it to be excellent. I have come in contact, in the little training home for cadets at Winchester, and in other ways, with the girl soldiers, and have admired not only the heart work, but the outward and physical part of their training system. The conventional timidity and shrinking which were wont to be considered feminine are discouraged, equally with forwardness. They are taught, and attain, in most cases, a delightful union of courage and modesty. Self-consciousness must disappear; they must march, sing, speak, encounter opposition, bear ill-treatment, etc., with simplicity and modest pluck. They are singularly free from affectation. They may not speak with closed teeth, or in a mufiled voice. They are drilled as to manner of speaking, walking, carriage, etc. The countenance must be open and happy, if it is to answer truly to the joy of the saved soul. It may be in some cases hard to attain these outward accomplishments, but the effort to do so is a clear advantage to the girl cadet. As a rule, the manners of the Salvation Lasses are beautiful, in spite of occasional dropped h's, provincial accent, and other such defects. As women, we cannot but rejoice that even a portion of our women of the humbler ranks (an ever-increasing portion) is subjected to such a training as this. This is, however, but the outside. It is the work of the heart, through the influence of the Spirit of God over the whole being, transforming the character, which gives them the elevation which, for the most part, they possess, and the power of winning souls which very many of them have shown in a remarkable degree.

On the question of the equality of the sexes, Mrs. Booth was very firm. Her writings and speeches, as well as her practice, attest this. She entered fearlessly into the never-ending controversy concerning the meaning of St. Paul's supposed veto upon women preachers. I shall not go far into that subject here; it has been sufficiently treated, and the minds of most of us are sufficiently made up about it. None, probably, now dares to deny that the gift of prophecy promised in the Book of Joel to "sons and daughters" alike, "handmaidens" equally with others, was received and exercised in the Apostle's own time by women as by men. The dictum that they were not to "speak in the churches" remains (in the letter); but "speaking" (conversing, asking questions) in the churches, is now believed to have quite a different meaning from the speaking involved in prophesying or preaching. I recollect Mrs. Booth remarking in her quaint fashion that St. Paul must have had "a bad time of it" when he was staying in the house of Philip the Evangelist, for "Philip had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy." For the Apostle, with his supposed ideas of the unlawfulness of women's teaching, to reside in the same house with four women preachers, must have been a painful discipline. Mrs. Booth's arguments were not those of mere expediency, although it was obvious to her, as it is to every thoughtful woman, that the Church and Society have crippled their powers and resources by one-half throughout past centuries by silencing the voice of women. She claimed a deep responsibility of women to God alone in this matter.

Among the ancient Jews, when any perversion of principle or confusion of thought resulted in some national crisis, the cry was, "To the Law and the Testimony." This was the ultimate appeal of the Hebrew; but we have a higher tribunal to which we appeal. In relation to this question, our appeal has not been to St. Paul, but to Christ. While divines have wrangled over the words of the Apostle, they seem to have forgotten that a "greater than Paul is here." The teaching and actions of Christ were for all time; some of those of St. Paul were evidently directed to the special circumstances of his own time. The equality which Christ proclaimed is on the widest and deepest basis, and until that equality is admitted by Christendom, and recognized in our laws, religion, and customs, we shall continue to work with crippled powers, and be subject to a revival of the secret bitterness felt on the one side, and the assumption of superiority and privilege on the other, which have caused so much unhappiness. John Stuart Mill, in his book on the "Subjection of Women," said: "The practical feeling of the equality of human beings is the theory of Christianity, but Christianity will never practically teach it while it sanctions institutions grounded on an arbitrary preference of one human being over another." The worth of this remark turns entirely upon the meaning attached to the word "Christianity." Evidently Stuart Mill meant by it the teachings and customs which have adopted the name of Christ; if by the word he meant the truths and principles revealed and taught by the Saviour of men, then the above sentence would be self-contradictory; for pure Christianity — in other words, Christ—could not at once teach the equality of all human beings and the justice of arbitrary preference of one over another. Christ is the light, and in Him is no darkness at all. He is at one with Himself. He never, either directly or indirectly, sanctioned "customs or institutions grounded on an arbitrary preference."

By Christianity did the writer mean "the Church"? Perhaps, like many others, he mistook the traditions of a vitiated Church, formed on the capricious decrees of certain Councils or Fathers, for the essential ethics of Christ. I do not know myself to what rightly to apply the name of Church if not to a "company of faithful men and women," who throughout all the ages have reflected the teaching of Christ in its integrity. In such a company, women will be found answering as fearlessly as men to the call of God for the evangelization of the world, and men will as frankly make way for them in the great harvest-field. They will grant a "fair field and no favour." In this the Salvation Army is leading the way. God himself will take care of the consequences. But, after all, the great answer to this controversy lies in facts. Women have found a voice; women now preach (or prophesy); and God has set His seal upon their word and work. St. Paul's pronouncement must stand aside a little to be judged under the clearer light which is coming.

Mrs. Booth says in her address on "Female Ministry":

> "Whether the Church will allow women to speak in her assemblies can only be a question of time. Common-sense, public opinion, and the blessed results of female agency will force her to give us an honest and impartial rendering of the solitary text on which she grounds her prohibitions. Then when the true light shines, and God's words take the place of man's traditions, the Doctor of Divinity who shall teach that Paul commands women to be silent when God's Spirit urges her to speak, will be regarded much in the same way as we should regard an astronomer who should teach that the sun is the earth's satellite."

The women of the Salvation Army through all their ranks are learning, and will learn more and more, the grand lesson of personal responsibility toward the poor and miserable of the earth. Far beyond the Salvation Army itself an impulse has been given in this direction, and no women except those who are living the death-in-life life of pleasure are now indifferent to these great questions. The sense of responsibility which tender-hearted women must have ever felt has been till recently of a cramped nature. It has been painful to them to see squalid misery, however well deserved, and pleasant to them to hear words of gratitude, however shallow, and to see some present relief given, however temporary. They have had to learn to withstand the temptation of winning this cheap pleasure, and to refrain from an interference which only makes matters worse. They have had to learn to feel their responsibility as parts of the nation, to rise to the sense of national life. Nothing but the sense of a common life can strengthen us to confront our duty in a large sense in regard to the pressing social problems of our times.

A word in conclusion. In the teaching and experience of the Salvation Army, there has sometimes been said to be a blank. There is a great and deep truth which does not seem so much exemplified by them as other truths—that is, the truth concerning the waiting attitude, the silence of the soul before God, the long patience, the blotting out of self that God may act—that most difficult of all lessons which the Christian believer must learn; to be still, to leave his cause in God's hands, the cause for which he has laboured, wept and suffered, and for which his own will has been denied and slain. There does not seem to have been much opportunity in the history of this great movement for the exercise of the waiting spirit. It is a history of action, of Jehu-driving throughout, without drawing rein, without pause. And we rejoice in this; the King's business requires haste; the days are evil; the times are filling up; the Judge is at the gate; the world is waiting to be saved; and there is no time to be lost.

Yet there are other sides of God's working for the world's salvation. He leads Dispensationally and by periods. We do not learn all His ways, or all our lessons at once. What tremendous lessons does He not teach us at His chosen times in the matter of enforced waiting, and taking our own hand off the work, leaving Him to work! Perhaps to every deeply taught child of God this teaching comes sooner or later; frequently it is the very last lesson learned. In the history of most great movements it has also had a place. So deep a subject cannot be adequately treated in a few words in a brief article, but there is abundant food for thought here, in regard to the Divine significance of periods of testing, and of those pauses of deep import which have taken place before some unmistakable further declaration of God's will toward humanity, either in particular or at large. The mind's eye sweeps over the instances in the Bible of such an eventful hiatus in the history of many—of nearly all—of those who were used especially to impart a definite message to the world—Moses, Elijah, Jonah, David (his reign at Hebron), St. Paul, and Jesus Christ. Our Lord's periods of twice forty days—forty days in the wilderness, and forty days between the resurrection and the ascension—in each of these the time was one of suspended work and suspended action. To all appearance it was a fruitless time as regards fulfilment, as if forces were arrested and development checked. We cannot penetrate the Divine mind, or say why these things were and are so; but doubtless we touch here on some profound law of the Eternal Kingdom. When we see such a period in our own lives, or in the lives of God's children around us, or in the life of some great spiritual movement, we are not discouraged. On the contrary, we lift up our heads, because we know that the result is fixed and cannot fail us, that if the blessing tarry we must wait for it, but wait in the full assurance of faith and confident expectation. But more than this; there may be even a necessity in the divine economy, and from the side of God himself, for such periods of apparently arrested action and progress. It is the short-sightedness of even spiritually educated Christians which alone makes it possible to grudge such times of passivity, or to blame any on whom the hand of God is laid—it may be for years—for the revelation of the mysterious fruitfulness of enforced exclusion and silence.

This brings me to speak—I do so with reverence—of the last sore and prolonged trial to which Mrs. Booth was subjected. "He saved others; himself he cannot save." These words may have inflicted one of the sharpest wounds which the Son of Man, as man, endured as He hung upon that cross. Our friend probably realized in those two and a half years of pain, as she could never have done in her active career, the experience of those who are called to "fill up that which is left behind of the sufferings of Christ."

One of her family wrote to me during her illness: "I am learning now, as if it were for the first time, that *faith is not sight.*" Yes, there is something beyond, some deep and tender mystery of God beyond what our spiritual sight, sharpened though it may be, can yet fathom. We have contemplated with wonder and praise the happiness of her life in some respects. She was indeed in one way "blessed among women." She saw her large family of sons and daughters, not only each and all given heart and soul to God and His work, but each becoming a centre of life and of power in the evangelizing of the world. Thousands of mothers have looked upon her felicity and blessedness as a mother, and thanked God. Certain parents, teachers, and evangelists of tender conscience have unreasonably blamed themselves because they have not in any way shared the success which she had as a mother and a teacher. Indeed sometimes this stern and happy mother-preacher would remind other parents that it was probably their own fault if they did not yet see the full fruition of their heart's desire in those they sought to save. Very often, no doubt, these reminders were needed; sometimes the rebuke was just; but at other times it was not so. It is true that chastisement, often of a very heavy kind in regard to his life-work, has been laid upon a child of God for some lapse, or serious fault. To us Moses seems to have had provocation from the people he ruled beyond what man could bear. He gave way to anger, and was not permitted to enter the Land of Promise with those whom he had so faithfully led. But he had only to wait, "resting in hope." He did at last enter, and did see with his eyes that Promised Land, when he stood on the Mount of Transfiguration conversing with the Saviour of the world on His approaching decease—the supreme Sacrifice. He had longed to enter into that land and look upon those fair and fertile fields; and now, after centuries, he had his desire. It is not given to all to glorify God by long years of patience and waiting, to visit again and again sterile fields which have been faithfully sown and watered, and yet to hold on. These learn their lesson; a painful, wonderful lesson it is, and God is glorified by the learning of it. In the case of the leaders of the Salvation Army it seems that the harvest springs up as fast as the seed is sown; that all over the world fields that were only yesterday sown are already ripening to the harvest. Those fallow periods of cold waiting seem not yet to be appointed to enter that great mission of world-saving; and perhaps there will be increased acceleration only, kindling a hope of a near and present day of salvation for the peoples of earth, brighter and more blessed than any which has yet dawned on us. For the individual these times of unrequited waiting are the most severe tests of faith and trust in God which can be imposed. They are only to be borne by those who have become athletes in the spiritual warfare, whose thews and sinews are powerful enough to bear the strain of seeing nothing and yet believing, of resting upon the naked word of God, and realizing that it is a rock in the midst of a vast sea of darkness, of "departing in peace," and yet not being able to say, "for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation." This test can only be borne by the meekest soul of the most heroic soldier of Christ. Shall I be considered critical in saying that I have missed somewhat in the Consecration meetings of the Salvation Army the teaching which the unrequited labourer needs? That dear friend who has gone before may have learned of God, and imparted to others, deeper things from that cross on which she hung so long, than any which we have yet received; and, perhaps, among them, she has learned that of which we have only dim glimpses—the mysterious meanings of the apparently fruitless time of bodily martyrdom and pain.

General Booth says, with much pathos, in his "Darkest London,"—"I am now sixty-one years of age, and the last eighteen months, during which the continual partner of all my activity for now nearly forty years has lain in the arms of unspeakable suffering, have added more than many former ones to the exhaustion of my term of service." There is a truth which probably he does not for a moment forget, that to the truly Christian soul, death is invariably a prelude to a resurrection of a spiritual kind; the beginning of some fresh revelation. And this truth is becoming apparent even now in this particular case to all who have eyes to see or ears to hear. It is well to recall the teaching concerning the fellowship of the saints conveyed in a remarkable chapter in the Second Book of Kings. The two friends Elijah and Elisha walked together; the one passed over Jordan and returned no more; the other returned alone. The one who had gone had now entered into the higher service of the King; the true fellowship, begun while both walked together on earth, is deepened and enhanced now; the two are more spiritually in touch with each other than before; the current of the Divine life is now the mighty motive power in both, and the one within the veil walks by the same energy as the one witnessing to a crooked generation without the veil.

Is not the power of this strengthened and deepened communion, coming up from the valley of the shadow of death, to be seen in the resurrection to a new and extraordinary life of the many human and social forces which are waiting to be used for the taking away of the stone which holds Lazarus in his tomb? These social forces cannot in the highest and best sense be successful except when united with a tide of spiritual life. A vast and complicated organization has been planned; has been seen in a vision prophetically, something like the vision of Ezekiel. There are wheels within wheels; and the whole is to move on together. When quickened by the fire of the Spirit of God, it *will* move onward with the swiftness and power of those "living creatures" seen long ago by the eyes of the prophet.

GENERAL BOOTH'S SCHEME OF SOCIAL REFORM.

From *The Guardian* (Church of England), London, October 29, 1890.

A GOOD deal of expectation has been aroused, partly by means which Sheridan described once for all in the *Critic,* by the announcement that Mr. Booth, the "General" of the Salvation Army, is prepared with a scheme for abolishing, or at least profoundly ameliorating, the worst forms of poverty in England. The scheme has now appeared in the shape of a substantial volume; and the world is invited to judge of its merits, and to contribute toward its realization. It is not very easy to form an opinion of the plan detailed in the work which General Booth has chosen to entitle *In Darkest England,* for the author has mixed up essential with non-essential proposals, and has encumbered his scheme, which should first have been presented only in its most necessary outlines, with details which distract the reader's attention, and are in many cases highly controversial. But on careful inspection it is possible to clear away the subsidiary matter, and to distinguish the main outlines of what is, without any doubt, a very large and important scheme of social reform.

General Booth acknowledges "valuable literary help" received from a friend who has the deepest sympathy with the aims of the Salvation Army. Most readers of the book will find it easy to guess the identity of the friend so described, for signs of his literary help are visible on every page, especially in the first part, in which the condition of the poor is described. We must confess that the assistance he has rendered, if we are right in thus tracing it, seems to us a very doubtful benefit to the scheme. The book is written throughout in an excited, sensational style, and the needs of the poor in London are commended to us not by a careful and well-weighed statement of facts, but by exaggerated metaphors and misleading comparisons. We could have wished for less journalistic skill and for more solid evidence as to the actual state of things. For instance, the author refers with commendation to one alone of his precursors in the study of the poorest classes, and that is his namesake, Mr. Charles Booth. Now, if there is one thing more than another, besides his admirable skill and patience in investigation, which marks Mr. C. Booth's volume on *Life and Labour in East London,* it is in his refusal to adopt a pessimistic tone, keenly alive though he is to the actual misery that exists. On the contrary, he definitely declares that the state of things in East London is improving, and has improved so far back as we are able to trace it. But General Booth knows, or at least says, nothing of improvement. He is not a pessimist, indeed, for his strong religious faith forbids him to despair; but he will not believe that the present condition of the poor can be an improvement on an earlier state. In particular he declares that children are worse off than they were, that education has failed to improve them, and that the new generation is likely to be more lawless and vicious than its predecessors. It may be so, but he gives us no real evidence of it. What definite facts there are against him. Crime is not increasing, but rather diminishing, and that in a very marked way. And the influence of the Education Act, partial though it is, and even in some ways injurious, is recognized as on the whole beneficial by all thoughtful observers of the poor. At all events, we deprecate language which implies that things are far worse now than they were. So far as we know they are not, and language of this kind creates an impression of exaggeration and inaccuracy which injures the cause it is meant to support. In this case the first part of the book prejudices the rest, but the reader who perseveres will be agreeably surprised, when he reaches the practical proposals, by the sensible and eminently business-like manner in which Mr. Booth has thought out his scheme. It bears all the marks of being the work of a man with a genius for organization, and if it does not succeed it will not be for want of a thorough and comprehensive grasp of details.

The scheme in its essence, divested of a good many subsidiary proposals which Mr. Booth throws out almost incidentally, is very simple. Starting from the experience gained in working the food and shelter depots which the Salvation Army has established in London, the "General" proposes to establish "a receiving house for the destitute" in every large town. These receiving houses would not only supply food and shelter, but would have labour yards attached to them where the destitute could be set to work till they have shown how far they were willing and able to earn their bread if opportunity were given to them. The work would not be only of a uniform and laborious kind, as it too often is in the casual wards of workhouses, but the great numbers to be dealt with will, it is expected, allow of a chance being given to all, whatever their crafts may be. So far the scheme sounds like little more than an improved workhouse. But the distinguishing and the essential element is that the work in these labour yards or factories is to be probationary, and that those who show themselves able and willing to work will be passed on to the second stage in the scheme, the farm colony, if, that is, they seem to be fitted for agricultural work. Mr. Booth proposes to buy an estate of about a thousand acres, not far from London, of such land as is chiefly suitable for market-gardening. On this he will plant those whom the experience of his city colony has proved to be fitted for the work, and will form them into an industrial community, primarily agricultural, but having all the necessary subsidiary industries contained within its borders. The connection of this community with the city colony would facilitate the disposal of its products, as well as the utilization of the waste which would be collected by the city workers from the great town. Lastly, there is the colony over sea, to which will be drafted all those who in the city and the farm colony have proved themselves able to work and to prosper in such a life as the emigrant's. But it will not be an emigrant's life of the usual type, for the colonists will find themselves in a community prepared to receive them, they will be well acquainted beforehand with the kind of work they are to undertake, and above all they will be under strict rule and discipline. Here is the essential element in the whole of Mr. Booth's scheme. He has founded and still leads the Salvation Army by means of the most stringent and autocratic discipline, and he intends to make unquestioning obedience in the rank and file, and habits of command in the officers, the principle of success in his social reformation. The people he wishes to save are, he says, ready to obey, if any one will lead them; and he means to lead.

Such in brief outline is the scheme by which the General of the Salvation Army proposes to find a way out of darkest England, and for which he asks an endowment of 100,000*l.* With this sum he declares it can be set on foot, and it will require a further sum of 30,000*l.* annually to keep it going. We believe that the experiment is well worth trying, though we do not believe that, even taken together with the various subsidiary agencies which Mr. Booth sketches, it contains the final solution of the social problem. But it will probably do some good; it may possibly do much good. It adds the element of hope and encouragement to the workhouse system, and it deprives it of the official stamp, which is its greatest defect. The workhouse with the certainty, not only of escape, but of rising, is an experiment worth trying, and one which has not, on any large scale, yet been tried. But there is one great and obvious objection to the scheme considered as a panacea. It presupposes that the majority of those who form the destitute class are willing to work. Mr. Booth has put the question to 250 men in his London shelters and has been answered in the affirmative. Indeed, he says, no thoughtful person could assign "a rational reason" for their refusal.

But that is just the difficulty. The social reformer has to deal with a class of persons who can give no rational reason for not working, and who yet, for the most part, will not work. We believe that Mr. Booth's scheme will benefit those who, though willing to work, have been pressed out of work by competition, and will do something to free the stream of employment from the weeds that choke it ; but the true social problem is caused by the lowest stratum of all, and this stratum Mr. Booth will only touch ; he will not permanently influence it, for it will escape from every form of improvement that involves a labour test.

THE FOURFOLD REGENERATION.

BY REV. CANON A. R. FAUSSET.

From *The Theological Monthly* (London), November, 1890.

> " Ring out the old, ring in the new—
> —Ring out the want, the care, the sin,
> The faithless coldness of the times—
> —Ring out old shapes of foul disease ;
> Ring out the narrowing lust of gold ;
> Ring out the thousand wars of old,
> Ring in the thousand years of peace.
> —Ring out the darkness of the land,
> Ring in the Christ that is to be !"

So sings our Poet-Laureate. He embodies in felicitous phrase the yearnings of thoughtful men after a new and better order of things than that which now prevails. Even secular journals recognize the disorder of our present state, due to men setting aside the Divine law as the regulator of life, and substituting short-sighted regard to present interests.

Worldly men are all the while dreaming of " a good time coming" through the diffusion of secular education, the marvellous discoveries of science, and the modern inventions ministering to material comforts. Similarly, one might have expected that the age before the first Advent, characterized as it was by the development of man's reason, imagination, and æsthetical culture, would have been also an age of moral progress. The voice of God's revelation was silent for four hundred years down from Malachi, the last of the Old Testament Prophets. It was the age of Demosthenes, the orator ; Praxiteles, the sculptor ; Plato and Aristotle, master minds in philosophy. God left man to himself to see what he could do by art and science to regenerate the world. The result was corruption, and a deep sense of wretchedness. Plato, in the *Alcibiades*, acknowledges the need there was of some Great Teacher to come from heaven. Side by side with high civilization and refinement existed moral depravity, and an aching void in man's spirit which no earthly culture could fill. Then, where man could devise no remedy, God broke the long silence with the New Testament call in the wilderness, " Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Again, for a greatly longer period the spoken voice from heaven is silent, ever since the manifestation of Him who is the Brightness of the Father's glory, and the express Image of His Person. The Written Word indeed witnesses for God and His Christ. But man's tendency now is to deny its Divine authority as the rule and standard of life. Hence, side by side with his dream of a new and better age to be ushered in by his own working independently of God, there are ominous symptoms of desperate evils lurking beneath the glazed surface of our boasted civilization, and ready at any moment to upheave the social system.

1. God's plan for renewing His own world is the reverse of man's. Man begins from without ; God begins within. Man sets up his kingdom with show, and " a mouth speaking great things :" throughout this age, " the kingdom of God cometh not with observation." The first step toward it is *the regeneration of individual souls* by the Holy Spirit. " Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." Born of fleshly parents, we cannot but be fleshly in nature. Water cannot rise above its own level ; nor can we of ourselves rise above our sin-tainted birth-nature. If we are to dwell with heavenly beings in a kingdom of holiness, we must receive a new and spiritual nature corresponding to that kingdom's environments. The Holy Ghost is the power from above which quickens man's spirit, so that he is born again, and becomes in Christ " a new creature." This is the FIRST REGENERATION. The new word (παλιγγενεσία, Tit. iii. 5) is coined in the Christian mint to represent a new spiritual truth. To be born of the Holy Spirit is to be born into a new world, altogether distinct from the world into which we are born by nature. It is as great a miracle in grace, as in nature it would be to enter a second time into the mother's womb and be born. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually discerned ; but he that is spiritual judgeth all things. So completely alien to the kingdom of God is the

fleshly or natural mind, that Holy Scripture declares “ it is enmity against God,” and not only is not subject to the law of God, but even “ CANNOT be” so. Whereas, if the Spirit of God dwell in a man, he is spiritually minded, which is life and peace : he has the marks of regeneration ; “ he does not practise (*ποιεῖ* : present tense, 1 John iii. 9) sin” habitually : “ he by faith overcometh the world :” “ he knows that he has passed from death to life because he loves the brethren.” All these fruits of the Spirit are due not to the believer’s works, but to God’s mercy, which “ saves us through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.” Regeneration is the Father’s gift to them that ask Him. It reveals Christ the Son in the soul. It is the work of the Almighty Quickening Holy Spirit.

II. THE REGENERATION OF THE BODY. The only other passage in the New Testament in which the word “ regeneration” is found uses it in reference to the future. The Lord Jesus promises to His followers, as their reward, “ In the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel ” (Matt. xix. 28). God’s order in restoring a lost world is beautifully progressive. He begins by regenerating the souls of believers now. There can be no regeneration to glory hereafter, except there be first the regeneration by grace now. Wherever this has been wrought here, though the body be still subject to death, the spirit has in it life from above. This life imparted by the Holy Spirit to the believer’s spirit is the pledge that the body, too, shall be quickened by the same Almighty Spirit. The resurrection of Jesus’ body is the earnest of our resurrection, if we be already born again of the Spirit. It is the same Divine Worker who puts forth His energizing might in our resurrection as in His. For only “ if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelt in us, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also our mortal bodies through His Spirit that dwelleth in us” (Rom. viii. 11). Such alone as are spiritual are “ counted worthy to obtain the resurrection from the dead” (Luke xx. 35). All shall arise. The saints alone attain unto the “ resurrection from out of the rest of the dead” (*τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν*, Phil. iii. 11). This is the grand object of ambition to them, as it was to Paul. It is not mere reanimation or revivification, as that of Lazarus. It is *regeneration* of the body to a higher life : as the soul has been previously raised from the fleshly to the spiritual life. The body is sown a psychic or animal body, it is raised a pneumatic or spiritual body. The animal soul ruled in that, the Spirit rules in this. Sown in corruption, dishonour, and weakness, the saint’s body is raised in incorruption, glory, and power (1 Cor. xv.). No longer will our vessel of clay weigh us down, when our spirits would soar to God. For, whatever attribute Christ’s ascended body possesses, ours too shall possess : at His coming, “ He will transfigure the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of His glory, according to the working whereby He is able even to subject all things unto Himself ” (Phil. iii. 20, 21). This is the first resurrection. It ushers in the millennial reign of Christ and His transfigured saints in the heavenlies over Israel and the nations in the flesh upon earth. The rest of the dead shall not live again until the thousand years are finished. “ Blessed and holy is He that hath part in the first resurrection ; on such the second death has no power, but they shall be priests of God and Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years.” Material obstacles will not impede the glorified body, just as the closed doors could not prevent the risen Saviour from standing in the midst of the disciples. Equal to the angels, we shall move with lightning-speed whithersoever we will.

Connected closely with the saints’ resurrection is their heavenly sonship. It was so with Jesus ; it shall be so with them. He was as truly the everlasting Son of the Father when “ He emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, and being made in the likeness of men,” as when He shares the Father’s glory before the world was.

> “ As much when in the manger laid,
> Eternal Ruler of the sky,
> As when the six days’ work He made
> Filled all the morning stars with joy.”

But in His humiliation His Sonship, though real, was not manifested. It was His resurrection that vindicated His claim, the Father Himself attesting Jesus’ Sonship by raising Him from the dead. This is expressly affirmed by St. Paul (Rom. i. 4), “ Jesus Christ, born of the seed of David according to the flesh, declared to be the Son of God, with power according to the Spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead.” He is therefore named “ The Firstborn from the dead ” (Col. i. 18). So believers are sons of God from the moment that they first believe in Jesus Christ (Gal. iii. 26). But as the unbelieving did not recognize Jesus' Sonship in the days of His humiliation, so they cannot recognize our sonship as yet. It will be our resurrection in His glorious likeness that will manifest our sonship, as St. John testifies (1 John iii. 1, 2), "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God; and such we are. For this cause the world knoweth us not, because it knew Him not. Beloved, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, when He shall be manifested, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him even as He is." Our Sonship is real now; then first it shall be manifested. Therefore, though in a true sense already adopted, we still "wait for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." A forcible word expresses the saint's intense longing for the manifestation of their sonship, "The earnest expectation (*ἀποκαραδοκία*, with uplifted heads and outstretched necks) of the creature waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God" (Rom. viii. 19).

The resurrection or regeneration of the body at Christ's coming will be the preliminary to the gathering of the saints unto their everlasting communion with one another in Him. In their disembodied state between death and the resurrection they are "absent from the body," which is the instrument of the soul's activities, and "present with the Lord," shut up unto Him alone. St. Paul does not comfort the Thessalonian mourners with the prospect of restored communion with their deceased loved ones at death, but at "the coming of our Lord Jesus, and our gathering together unto Him" (1 Thess. iv. 13–18; 2 Thess. ii. 1). Therefore Holy Scripture does not rest our chief hope on the bliss of the soul at death, but on our Lord's return to transfigure the bodies of the elect whose souls have been already regenerated by His Holy Spirit. "We must all be then made manifest before His judgment seat, that each may receive the things done *through the body* (*διὰ τοῦ σώματος*, 2 Cor. v. 10), whether it be good or bad." How this truth ought to constrain us to "cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

III.—The regeneration of the nations. This age begins with the translation of the Lord Jesus. It is consummated in the transfiguration and translation of the saints. They shall be "caught up to meet the Lord in the air." Then He, and they with Him, as "the armies of heaven," returning, inflict the decisive blow on Antichrist and his apostate hosts, which issues in the overthrow of the usurper Satan's reign, and in the establishment of the kingdom of Him "whose right it is." Jerusalem, the scene of the conflict, shall become "the throne of Jehovah Jesus, and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of Jehovah, neither shall they walk any more after the stubbornness of their evil heart" (Jer. iii. 17).

This shall be the regeneration of the nations. Now is the time of the regeneration of individuals. God is now "visiting the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name" (Acts xv. 14). Therefore our age is designated "the times (opportunities, *καιροι*) of the Gentiles." This is their day of grace and privilege, wherein all believers, without distinction of Jew and Gentile, are being gathered into the elect Church. This Church, when completed, will reign with Christ in the heavenlies over the millennial nations on earth. Jerusalem, now trodden down of the Gentiles, shall then assume the primary place among the nations which was designed for her from the beginning: for "when the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the children of men, He set the bounds of the peoples, according to the number of the children of Israel" (Deut. xxxii. 8). Jerusalem will, then, first realize God's gracious purpose of making her the spiritual metropolis, and Israel the centre and mediator of blessing to the world. As God saith (Ezek. v. 5), "I have set her in the midst of the nations." Thus, "Jehovah will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem" (Zech. ii. 10), and Jerusalem in the midst of the nations.

In our age "the Gospel is being preached for a witness unto all the nations," and when that witness shall have been completed "the end shall come" (Matt. xxiv. 14), the elect Church (comprising "the remnant according to the election of grace" out of Israel, and "the fulness of the Gentiles") having been gathered out from Jews and Gentiles (Rom. xi. 5, 25). The Lord's coming shall introduce an age wherein "a nation shall be brought forth at once; and as soon as Zion shall travail, she shall bring forth children" (Isa. lxvi. 8, 9). It is when the Father shall have "set His King upon His holy hill of Zion," that "He will give the heathen for His Son's inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession" (Psa. ii. 8). The veil shall be taken off Israel first, then off all people (2 Cor. iii. 16; Isa. xxv. 7). There cannot be a conversion of the *nations* in our age before Christ's coming, since His first act in introducing His manifested kingdom will be to smite the apostate nations with the rod of His mouth (Isa. xi. 4–9 ; Zech. xii., xiii., xiv.); then shall follow His reign in peace and righteousness (Psa. ii. 9 ; Dan. ii. 34, 35 ; Rev. ii. 26, 27 ; xi. 15–17 ; xix. 11—xx. 6). The seventh and last trumpet must first sound before "He shall take His great power and reign, and the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ."

The manifestation of Christ and His transfigured saints in glory, the destruction of Antichrist, and the binding of Satan (Rev. xv. 4 ; xx. 1), will predispose the nations in the flesh to embrace the Gospel. It is because "the Lord's righteous judgments shall have been made manifest, that nations shall all come and worship before Him." "The receiving of Israel," after their being so long outcast through unbelief, "will be life from the dead" to the Gentile world (Rom. xi. 15). "The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains" first ; then "all nations shall flow unto it ; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Isa. ii. 2, 3) : men shall call the Jews "priests of Jehovah, ministers of our God" (lxi. 6), because they shall be God's mediators of blessing to the nations. So "Jehovah will be King over the whole earth ; Jehovah shall be one and His name one" (Zech. xiv. 9). Jesus first "will declare God's name unto His brethren" (the Jews), then "all the ends of the earth shall remember, and turn unto Jehovah" (Psa. xxii. 22–27).

The heavens must receive Jesus now "until the times of restoration of all things." When He shall visibly come forth from the heavens, Israel shall be restored to their own land and to His favour. The Kingship over all the nations shall be restored to the rightful Owner, "the King of Israel," and "King of the nations." The millennial people will be prepared for passing without death into a higher state, as Adam would, had he never fallen. Death will exceptionally occur on earth in the millennium, but only as a judgment on the sinner ; for though Satan shall be bound, and the world be pervaded with Divine influences, there will still remain *the flesh,* whence shall arise the possibility of sin (Isa. lxv. 20 ; Eph. ii. 2, 6 ; vi. 12).

When "Jehovah shall punish the ten anti-Christian kings of the earth upon the earth," Satan, "prince of the powers of the air," and his "host of high ones on high" (Isa. xxiv. 21, 22), shall be supplanted by Christ and His transfigured saints in the heavenlies, who from thence shall reign over Jerusalem and the nations in the flesh. Christ and His saints of the first resurrection will be the mediators of blessing to these, as Israel in their turn will be to the nations. Thus there will be a blessed chain of giving and receiving : God the Father, Christ the transfigured Bride (the translated Church), Israel in the flesh, and the world of nations in the flesh ; Church and State will be co-extensive ; the Church and the world will be no longer mutually antagonistic : the distinction will cease, for the Church will be co-extensive with the world, and the world with the Church ; art, science, and music will be the handmaids to spiritual worship, not, as too often now, abused to sensuousness. It will be especially the time of liturgy of "the great congregation" (Psa. xxii. 25 ; Ezek. xl.–xlviii.; Zech. xiv. 16–20 ; Isa. ii. 3), as now is the time of preaching. It will be a time of Sabbath peace, uninterrupted by wars. Even the savage beasts shall lose their ferocity, and be subject to man, as in Eden. Christ's King-Priesthood shall be explained in the services of the glorious temple at Jerusalem. The theocracy of God in Christ shall supersede the misrule of earthly potentates over the nations ; and "the kingdom, and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms *under the whole heavens* (*i.e.*, UPON EARTH) shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High. His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve Him" (Dan. vii. 27).

IV. REGENERATION OF THE EARTH. Even during the millennium there is a separation between heaven and earth, the transfigured Church in the heavenlies and the nations in the flesh on earth. It is true there will be during the millennium an intercommunion of Christ and His transfigured saints in the heavenlies with Israel and the nations in the flesh on earth, such as was the intercourse of Christ, and Elijah, and Moses in glorified bodies with Peter, James, and John in the flesh on the mountain of transfiguration. Such also was that of Christ with His disciples during the forty days between His resurrection and His ascension. It will be one sweet joy of the transfigured saints who reign from heaven over the earth to lead their brethren in the flesh to the precious Saviour. But still there will be a distinction between heaven and earth, humanity transfigured and humanity in the flesh. Man's old birth sin, *i.e.*, "the flesh," will remain, when the other two sources of evil, Satan and the world, shall be restrained. From it will break out the last apostasy headed by Satan in person. In the judgment on it by fire the world of nature shall be destroyed. The leper's house had to be taken down because of the fretting leprosy cleaving to its walls.

As the regeneration of individual SOULS takes place now, and the resurrection of the saints' BODIES and the regeneration of the NATIONS at the millennium, so the regeneration of THE EARTH, man's home, shall be after the millennium. The new earth and new heaven will be the abode of perfect righteousness. The same Holy Spirit who brooded over the waters at the original creation, and who regenerates the souls of believers, and who will raise their bodies to immortality and regenerate the nations, will finally, at the Father's word, "make all things new" (Rev. xx. 11 ; xxi. 1 ; 2 Peter iii. 6–13). "Thou sendest forth Thy Spirit, they are created : and Thou renewest the face of the earth" (Psa. civ. 30). Then shall the upper and lower congregations be no longer separate. For the New Jerusalem, the Church of the Firstborn, the Firstfruits of redemption, shall descend from God out of heaven. She shall have the glory of God in her ; and "the nations," regenerated in the millennium and then translated, "shall walk amidst the light thereof" (Rev. xxi. 24). The millennial earth shall not be the home of the transfigured saints, but the kingdom over which they rule (the extent of that rule being proportional to their present faithfulness, Luke xix. 16–19). On the other hand, the post-millennial earth, regenerated from all past imperfections, such as the raging and restless sea, the earthquakes and convulsions of nature, and the trail of the serpent, shall be the saints' fit abode and home forever. The elect Church, as the New Jerusalem, in whom God Himself dwells, the centre of the regenerated nations, shall hold the primacy among the saved, because she alone shall have witnessed for Christ in the face of the present opposing world and the prince of darkness (Rev. xxi. 24).

A *solitary* pair was in the Original Paradise. In the final one, city and garden shall be combined ; perfect *communion* of saints with INDIVIDUAL blessedness. No more pain, no more crying, no more death, for there will be no more sin. The saints will be under the blessed necessity of sinning no more. God in Christ will be all in all, and "His saints shall reign forever and ever." Lord, hasten the time and Thy kingdom !

CHRISTIAN SOCIAL LIFE.

BY THE REV. HUGH MACMILLAN, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E.

"We are members one of another."—EPHESIANS iv. 25.

From the *Quiver* (London), December, 1890.

ONE of the most remarkable methods of preventing the encroachments of the sea upon the land, and fixing the loose sand along the shore, is by means of plants specially adapted for the purpose. These plants belong mostly to the grass tribe, though some are furnished with the flowers and foliage of higher orders. But they all possess in common the peculiarity of creeping underground stems, which at short intervals send up fresh shoots above the surface, and root themselves in the soil. These creeping underground stems enable them to subsist in the barren sand, and endure during long periods of drought and sterility ; while the rooting of the stems at frequent intervals, producing new individuals at every joint, all linked together, enables them to offer an effectual resistance to the storm. If undisturbed, these wonderfully constructive plants would speedily cover the largest tract of sea-shore spontaneously, prevent the loose masses of sand thrown up by the waves from drifting, and render the soil sufficiently stable to support higher vegetation.

Man has taken advantage of the peculiar habit of these sea-side plants, and planted them along the banks which he erects as a barrier against the sea, and which without these would be blown away by the first hurricane. The enormous dikes which the people have constructed in Holland, to keep out the inundations of the German Ocean, owe their stability to these plants, which are carefully protected by the Government ; and along the low eastern side of England, where the sea is seeking continually to encroach upon the shore, and is with great difficulty kept back, a large quantity of dry land has in this way been reclaimed from the waters.

It is the social habit of these sea-side plants that gives them their wonderful tenacity of life, and admirably adapts them for the conditions in which they grow. Each separate plant is weak and fragile ; and if left to itself it would speedily perish in its sterile situation, and would be uprooted and swept away by the fury of the tide. But when linked and interlaced in the closest fashion, by a vital bond, with the whole mass of similar plants growing around, it can hold its own against the strongest forces of the ocean. It is as nearly indestructible from natural causes as anything can be; and it is one of the most striking proofs of the power of feeble things that are endowed with life, when in combination, to resist the mightiest forces of dead mechanical nature.

We may learn a wise lesson from this herb of the field if we consider how it grows, and apply the parable of its peculiar mode of growth to our own religious life. What we have to do as Christians in the world is akin to the work of the sea-side grass. We have to prevent the encroachments of error, to beat back the waves of evil, to resist the storms of temptation, and to win new additions to the Kingdom of righteousness and peace. And we can only do this, in the high realm of spiritual life, in the same way that the sea-side grass does its task in the lower realm of physical nature, viz., by association. As the grass-plants are members one of another by means of the creeping and rooting stems that connect them together, and make of all the plants spread over a wide area but one plant in reality, so Christians are members one of another by means of the faith and love in Christ Jesus that unite them together and make of them, however numerous and widely scattered, one body in the Lord.

It is true indeed that the Christian religion is intensely personal. It brings out into high relief the individuality of every human being more than anything else. Its chief and constant appeal is to the individual conscience. Its salvation is a salvation of the individual soul. It separates a man from the mass of his fellow-creatures, and brings him into personal relations and transactions with the living God. There may be communion of worldly goods, but spiritual gifts from their very nature can only be personal possessions. And the design of all the means of grace is to make a man realize his individuality, with all the solemn responsibilities connected with it. Every man must bear his own burden; every man must give an account of himself to God.

But while this is profoundly true, we must not at the same time lose sight of the fact that the Christian religion is intensely social. Its design is to form the one perfect society of earth and heaven. For the origin of the social element in religion we must go back to Eden, when God said, "It is not good for man to be alone"—even though he had the high society of the Godhead and of the angel world—and provided for him a partner with whom his own nature and experience would be completed, and he would be best fitted to worship and serve God. And after the fall, God's purposes and man's thoughts were directed not to the restoration of the lost Garden of Eden with its solitary pair, but to the formation of the City of God, a far larger community than could exist in Eden. The Bible is a continuous description of the preparation of this City—the perfecting not only of man's personal life, but also of his social life: the constituting anew, by the work of grace, not only of the relations of man to God, but also of those of man to man which sin had destroyed. Men are taught and trained on the ground both of the Law and the Gospel to love God supremely, and to love one another with pure hearts fervently. Love is ever represented as the end of the Law and the Prophets, and as more than all sacrifices and ceremonials of religion.

It is a suggestive fact that the Christian religion did not begin with one believer, but with two. John, the last prophet of the old Covenant, when he met with the Fulfiller of all prophecy, handed over to Him two of his own disciples. In all likelihood if there had been only one disciple he would not have taken this critical step beyond the Baptist to follow the Lord; but the two were helpful to each other. One of them was Andrew, and he findeth his brother Simon Peter, and saith unto him, "We"—for his companion was still in his company—"We have found the Christ," and he brought him to Jesus. Thus the tie of flesh and blood was made, according to the natural order, and according to God's appointment, the channel of grace; and the Gospel course, starting in the home, proceeded along the lines marked out by the relations of human life.

The next day Jesus found Philip, and Philip found Nathanael, and so the missionary spirit spread and the great gathering of the disciples began. We have here the rudiments of Church life; for the disciples found a new society when they found Christ. Each new disciple that joined the Lord was joined in Him to all the other disciples. His new relationship to Christ brought him into a new relationship with his brethren. And thus having begun as a social institution, Christianity grew and spread like the sea-side grass, as a society of disciples—all united by a vital tie, of whom Christ was the Head, and His teaching and work the main substance of their fellowship. Differing from one another, as they differed from all outside, their very differences helped their unity and influenced each other. There were subordinate groups and divisions among them; but these no more interfered with the harmony of their spiritual association than the differentiation of their bodies into two eyes, or two hands, or five fingers and toes, broke up the unity of their natural life. One was their Master, and they were all brethren, members one of another.

In less than four years after the two found the Messiah, we read that three thousand souls continued in the teaching and fellowship of the Apostles; and all that believed were together, united in a way before unknown, not by the surface affections and interests which are called into every-day activity by the common concerns of life, but by those pure religious feelings which are planted deep down in man's nature beyond the reach of all selfish considerations. The essential rudiments of a Church which we find in the first small company of the disciples, expanded into the full form of the Christian Church after the resurrection and the outpouring of the Spirit, and the establishing of the apostolic preaching and order. And the Church has been in existence ever since, extending itself wherever the lifting up of Jesus Christ and Him crucified by the preaching of the Gospel has drawn men to Him, and to one another in Him.

We thus see that a true representation of the matter is not that Christians have social needs and duties, but that the very essence of Christianity is social. The social element is as much a part of its nature as its social habit is part of the constitution of the sea-side grass. It cannot exist without it. Believers are invariably regarded not as separate sheep, but as a flock; not as stones scattered about, but as built up together into a habitation of God through the Spirit; not as isolated plants, but as branches in the True Vine; not as solitary individuals, living each for himself, but as fellow-citizens of the saints and of the household of God.

The Christian religion sanctifies the social feelings, and presents to them new objects of interest and attachment. A man cannot, indeed, be a complete Christian by himself. There will be much in God and Christ which he cannot understand; for it is only "with all saints" that he can know the length and breadth and height and depth of the love that passeth knowledge, and be filled with all the fulness of God. There will be parts of his own nature that will not be called forth into exercise; there will be affections that will remain dormant or rudimentary in religious loneliness. To live a Christian life in the solitude of one's own heart, is an attempt entirely foreign to the nature of the Christian religion. If we are not to sink into selfishness, or into a selfish pursuit of our own religious interests, we must recognize our oneness with each other.

And as a man cannot be a complete Christian by himself, so no Church can be a complete Church that isolates itself from its sister Churches in the same Gospel. As the history of each individual believer is comprehended in a larger history than his own, so each Church is a part of the universal Church of Christ, and all the Churches supplement each other. Charity is the bond of perfectness that makes them members one of another, and unites them all together. And when its work is accomplished, it will gather from all the Churches and from all the ages the perfect society of the Kingdom of Heaven.

Thus the social element belongs to the very essence of Christianity. It is not as individuals only that we have to do with God and with the concerns of the soul and of eternity. We are taught in the Bible that God is a covenant God, blessing the children for the sake of the father, and linking the generations of His covenant people together with His faithfulness and mercy. We are taught that Jesus is the Son of Man, and becomes the Redeemer of our several persons because He is already the Redeemer of our common race. We are taught that as believers we are members of Christ's body, of His flesh, and of His bones, and therefore members one of another in Him. If we believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, we shall not only be saved ourselves, but also our house. If you dig up a plant of sea-side grass from the sand, you find that it is connected with a neighboring plant by a runner, and that it gives out itself a runner which connects it with another plant, and so on; and you thus find that the whole mass of this singular vegetation covering all the sea-shore is one vast corporate body, one multitudinous plant, all whose individual members are inseparably bound together. And so there is no selfish salvation in Jesus Christ. A man cannot be saved without wishing and helping to save some one else. We are bound to each other by tendrils of affection and runners of help; and the world which Christ saves is one in which varied activities and manifold kinds of character are at work together for the general good.

Without this social element, Christianity would have been uprooted and withered long ago. It could no more withstand the temptations and privations of the world, and the aridity of the dry and parched land where it has so often to grow, than a single plant of seagrass along the shore could withstand the fury of the winds and waves, or maintain itself in the dry and bitter sand. Believers must be members one of another, must join hand in hand, if they are to be fortified against the evil influences of the world, and to carry on the schemes of Christian benevolence for which they have received the Divine calling in their own salvation. It requires more courage than most individuals possess to do single-handed what is right whatever may be the consequences; but when believers are supported by others like-minded with themselves, they acquire great confidence. In the natural world, among objects that individually are insignificant, vast effects are produced by combination; and in the human world we see how necessary co-operation is in carrying out useful schemes and supporting benevolent institutions. And so it is by the united work of the Churches that the ministry of the Word and the ordinances of religion are supported and perpetuated year after year and generation after generation. If the whole grass of the sea-shore springs from a single root, Christianity itself is such a manifold growth in affiliated parts. The old Scandinavian myth of the Universal Tree is not far from the true conception of the Church of Christ, which He Himself significantly described when He said, "I am the Vine, ye are the branches," and when He compared the Kingdom of Heaven to the growth of the mustard-tree. It is not a mechanism, but an organism.

There is a strong tendency in these days to ignore the social nature of Christianity altogether, or to make light of it. Individualism in everything, but especially in religion, is the special outgrowth of our time. There are disintegrating forces at work breaking to pieces the old covenant ideas of the Christian faith, and separating individuals from each other in working out their salvation, instead of binding them to each other more closely. There seems to be a revolt against existing institutions, and a strong desire to individualize our work and worship, in opposition to the true spirit of the Church. We see professedly religious societies springing up outside of the Church, working on different lines, and seeking to undermine its authority and usefulness. Christ is thus preached of envy and strife; feelings of rivalry, of bitterness, and uncharitableness, are fostered in the minds of the people, instead of brotherly love. In Ceylon the number of ruined shrines near busy centres of population strikes the traveller with astonishment, and creates the impression that Buddhism has lost its hold upon the people and is decaying. But the real cause of these shrines being neglected is that it is considered far more meritorious to build a new temple than to maintain an old one in efficiency. It is the same reason that accounts for the number of old mosques in Cairo. It is a custom among Mohammedans as among Buddhists never to have a religious structure repaired; and so when it begins to give way the people build a new one, and leave the old one to its fate. And is this not the way in which too much of the Christian work of the present day is carried on? There is more outward show and apparent success in starting new agencies than in keeping useful and vigorous the ones already in existence.

As members one of another, united in a spiritual brotherhood, it is obvious that certain social duties necessarily spring from this association. The first and most important of these duties is obviously that of public worship. No command is more necessary than the apostolic precept, "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together," for none is more frequently and extensively disobeyed. Persons say that they can worship God at home as well as in church. No doubt they can; but it may be more than doubted whether the persons who urge that excuse do actually worship God at home. Christians have religious duties to perform in two relations equally important—duties as individuals, and duties as members of a corporate body; and the fact that they perform one set does not exempt them from the performance of the other. We are to worship God, not only as single persons, but also as members one of another. And it is the Christian custom of common worship that has consecrated the Christian Sabbath—made it not a day of rest merely, but a religious day. Our joining together in the services of the sanctuary communicates to the whole assembly of worshippers qualities which as individuals they do not possess. It is well known that when chemical substances are united, properties appear in the combination which were not found in the separate elements. The colour, the taste, the form is different. What was latent in the elements become apparent in the compound, and what was dormant in the parts is active in the whole. And so when we worship together as members one of another, thoughts and emotions cherished in common become warmer and more animated. We stimulate one another; and the bringing of us together is not merely the mechanical summing up of our separate capabilities, but is the chemical development, as it were, of a new and different power. If, instead of absenting ourselves from the church services, we all came to them regularly and with prepared hearts, how much more fervent and useful would our common worship be!

The Apostle in the text uses the fact that the Ephesian converts whom he addressed were members one of another, as a reason for their putting away lying and speaking every man truth with his neighbour. As newly converted heathens, accustomed under their old religion to the grossest falsehoods—as Easterns who had not the sense of the despicableness of a lie, which even worldly minded Western people have—the Apostle had to remind them continually that truthfulness was absolutely essential to union and co-operation—was one of the firmest bonds of brotherhood. We do not need, to the same extent, and in the same way, to be warned against the special sin of the Ephesian church. And yet is not the religious social world among us too often a nursery of falsehood and a school of scandal? How often is social peace destroyed by false insinuations and by the tongue of gossip! How often are sacred friendships destroyed and hearts embittered, owing to the want of transparent truthfulness of speech, and honesty of conduct, between fellow-members! Ill-natured gossip is one of the most fruitful sources of discord in the Church, doing more harm than all other causes put together; and it is absolutely impossible that we can be or continue in any real Christian sense members of one another if we are guilty of this form of untruthfulness.

People often complain that our churches are cold and selfish; that the members are strangers to each other; that they sit side by side in the same pew Sunday after Sunday, and never exchange a single friendly word or look with each other before or after service. In so far as this reproach is applicable to us, let us endeavour to remove it. Let us be kindly affectioned one to another when we meet, not only in church, but in the ordinary business and intercourse of life. Let us show that the unselfish and amiable religion of our Lord Jesus Christ is moulding our character and conduct in all things. Let us prove that the ties which bind us together are not merely temporary ties which touch only part of our being, and concern only this life, but ties of faith and love in Christ Jesus, which have regard to our whole nature and existence, and endure forevermore.

As members one of another, Christians must be mutually courteous and considerate. In a social capacity individuals cannot always have their own way. A single tree in a wide park may expand its branches as much as it can; but growing in a wood among other trees of the same kind, it must restrict its growth and accommodate itself to the requirements of its neighbours. It must allow them also fair access to heavenly air and light, and room to grow. We must yield a little even when we ought to have our right. We must let our moderation, or, as it should be translated, our *yieldingness*, be known unto all men, where principle is not concerned, but only self-interest.

Many members act harshly, and say hard things to each other, more from want of consideration than from any bad feeling. They do not place themselves in the position of others and realize how they themselves would feel in like circumstances. In nothing does a man's Christianity display itself more beautifully than in his refined courtesy and his gentle consideration for all men. May we ever remember that Christ came into the world, that He founded and preserves His Church from age to age in the world, in order to move men to love, to help, to save each other. And linked together, like the sea-side grass, by mutual vital runners of faith and love in Christ Jesus, the individual nurtured up for the brotherhood, and provoking one another unto all good works, we shall be able to take up arms against a sea of troubles, beat back the evil tides of the world, and win and cultivate a fair heritage for Him who loved us and gave Himself for us.

SOCIAL LIFE AMONG THE ASSYRIANS AND BABYLONIANS.

BY PROFESSOR SAYCE, LL.D., AUTHOR OF "FRESH LIGHT FROM THE ANCIENT MONUMENTS."

From *The Sunday at Home* (London), November, 1890.

I.—THE PEOPLE.

EZEKIEL tells us how in the latter days of the Jewish kingdom the palace walls of Babylonia were adorned with "images of the Chaldeans pourtrayed with vermilion, girded with girdles upon their loins, exceeding in dyed attire upon their heads, all of them princes to look to, after the manner of the Babylonians of Chaldea, the land of their nativity" (xxiii. 15). He had already described the Assyrians as "clothed in blue," "clothed most gorgeously, horsemen riding upon horses." They thus differed from the Chaldeans, while the Chaldeans again are distinguished from the Babylonians, who, however, inhabited the same country as themselves and were clothed with the same apparel.

The discoveries that have been made of recent years in the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates explain and illustrate the prophet's words. Chaldea or Babylonia—for the two names are used synonymously—was the alluvial plain shut in between the two great rivers of Western Asia, and extended southward from a point where they almost touched one another to the marshes at the head of the Persian Gulf where they flowed into the sea. Northward came the land of Assyria. It was originally the district which surrounded the ancient capital of Asshur, alluded to in the second chapter of Genesis (v. 14), built on the western bank of the Tigris. Still further to the north were the later capitals, Calah and Nineveh, between which stood Resen or Res-eni "the head of the fountain" (Gen. x. 11). The country of Assyria differed essentially from the country of Babylonia, and this difference exercised an influence upon the character of the populations which dwelt in them. Assyria was a land of limestone hills and thick forests, and was watered by the Tigris and its affluents, which cut their way through channels of rock. Babylonia, on the other hand, was flat and marshy ; its soil was rich and fertile, but the rivers and streams that intersected it could be prevented from flooding the country only by means of a carefully organized system of canals. The silt which was carried down to the sea was continually adding to the land and causing the shores of the Persian Gulf to advance southward ; cities which stood on the sea-coast in the early days of Babylonian history are now left far inland.

The district adjoining the sea, however, was distinguished from the rest of Babylonia by the great salt-marshes which covered it. It was accordingly known as the land of Marratu or "the salt-marshes," a name which appears in the Old Testament under the form of Merathaim (Jer. l. 21). In its midst rose the ancestral city of Merodach-baladan, whose ambassadors were shown by Hezekiah all the treasures of the Jewish monarchy.

Merodach-baladan was a Chaldean. The Chaldeans, or Kaldâ, as they are called on the monuments, were a tribe which inhabited the salt-marshes, and we first hear of them in the ninth century before our era. Whether they belonged to the same Semitic race as the inhabitants of Babylon we do not know. But under Merodach-baladan they became famous in the eastern world. Merodach-baladan made himself king of all Babylonia, and the Chaldeans became so integral and important an element in the population as henceforth to give it their name. From this time forward "Babylonian" and "Chaldean" became interchangeable terms.

The Babylonian race was by no means pure. The original inhabitants of the country had been the Accadians, or Sumerians, who spoke an agglutinative language like that of the modern Finns or Turks, and had been the authors of the cuneiform system of writing and of the culture of early Babylonia. They occupied both Accad, the northern division of Babylonia, and Sumir, or Shinar, its southern division. In Accad, however, they were subjected at an early epoch to the domination of Semitic tribes whose first home had been in Arabia ; in Sumir they held their ground for a longer period, and it is probable that the Semite did not succeed in superseding them in this part of the country until a comparatively recent time. The Semites of Babylonia were closely allied both in race and language to the Hebrews. It was from Ur of the Chaldees, now represented by the mounds of Mugheir, that Abraham had migrated, and the other cities of Babylonia must have been largely occupied by traders and settlers of the Semitic race.

Shortly after the age of Abraham the population of Babylonia became still further mixed in consequence of the successful invasion of the country by certain tribes of Elam. The Kassi, as they are termed on the monuments, settled in numbers in the Babylonian plain and established a dynasty of kings who ruled for several centuries. Accadian, Semite and Kassite intermarried and mingled together, forming a hybrid population which subsequently admitted into its midst the Chaldean tribes of the south. The people of Babylonia thus became what the English are to-day ; one of the most mixed of populations, tracing their descent from races of various origin.

Of far purer blood were the Assyrians in the north. Out of the land of Sumir, or Shinar, we are told, Asshur went forth to found the Assyrian kingdom (Gen. x. 11). It was a colony sent out by the Semitic part of the Babylonian population, and up to the last the Assyrians continued to represent both in appearance and character the pure Semitic type. The faces depicted on some of their monuments remind us of the Jewish faces we may meet with to-day in the more squalid streets of the great European cities.

Nature and descent accordingly combined to produce a difference between the inhabitants of Babylonia and of Assyria. The Babylonian was a stout thick-set man, somewhat short, with straight nose, wide nostrils, and square face. The Assyrian, on the other hand, was tall and muscular, his nose was slightly hooked, his lips were full, his eyes dark and piercing. His head and face showed an abundance of black curly hair. Such a type was in striking contrast to that of the early Accadian figures which have come down to us. Here the face is long and thin, with a straight beard not altogether unlike that represented on the faces of old men in Chinese art. What the peculiar characteristics of the Chaldean face may have been we have at present no means of deciding.

The Babylonian was essentially an irrigator and cultivator of the ground. The cuneiform texts are full of references to the gardens of Babylonia, and the canals by which they were watered. It was a land which brought forth abundantly all that was entrusted to its bosom. The palm was indigenous in it, so too, according to naturalists, was the wheat. Even in classical days the yield of Babylonian wheat was enormous. Herodotus tells us that it was sometimes as much as three hundred-fold to the sower. But the fear of floods and the reclamation of the marsh-lands demanded constant care and labour, the result being that the country population of Babylonia was, like the country population of Egypt, an industrious peasantry, wholly devoted to agricultural work and disinclined for war and military operations. In the towns, where the Semitic element was stronger, a considerable amount of trade and commerce was carried on, and the cities on the seacoast built ships and sent their merchantmen to distant lands. The Chaldeans, whose cry was in their ships (Isaiah xliii. 14), despatched their trading fleets to the southern coasts of Arabia and the quarries of the Sinaitic peninsula, and even, it would appear, to the shores of India.

The character of the Assyrian was altogether different from that of the Babylonian. He was a warrior, a trader and an administrator. The peaceful pursuits of the agricultural population of Babylonia suited him but little. His two passions were fighting and trading. But his wars, at all events in the later days of the Assyrian empire, were conducted with a commercial object, and were not the meaningless displays of brute fury and the love of bloodshed which they have usually been imagined to be. It was to destroy the trade of the Phœnician cities and to divert it into Assyrian hands that the Assyrian kings marched their armies to the west; it was to secure the chief highways of commerce that campaigns were made into the heart of Arabia and Assyrian satraps were appointed in the cities of Syria. The Assyrian was indeed irresistible as a soldier; but the motive that inspired him was as much the interest of the trader as the desire of conquest.

Unlike the Babylonian, he cared but little for education and literature. A knowledge of books was in Assyria confined to a few, more particularly the special class of scribes. A love of study is more likely to be developed among an agricultural than among a military people. Both Assyrians and Babylonians, however, were similar in one respect—they were both intensely religious. But here again we may note a difference between them. The religion of the Babylonians was far more mingled with superstition than was the religion of the Assyrian. While the Babylonian lived in hourly fear of the multitudinous demons which he believed to be ever on the watch to injure him, the Assyrian felt secure in the protection of his gods, above all of the supreme god Asshur. When the Assyrian kings went forth to war it was with a firm confidence that they were fighting the battles of Asshur, and that Asshur would give them success. It is "through trust in Asshur," they are perpetually telling us, that they overcome all opposition, and compel the disobedient to acknowledge the power of the great Assyrian deity.

The Assyrians seem to have lived mostly in towns. The country was cultivated by slaves, or by the older population whom the Semitic colonists found there. At all events it was from the population of the towns that the army was recruited and the ranks of the official bureaucracy were supplied. Consequently when the power of the army and of the upper classes was broken no force was left capable of resisting the foe. The continual wars of the Assyrian monarch drained the kingdom of its military class, while the Assyrian colonies which were planted as garrisons in conquered provinces, tended still further to diminish the dominant part of the population. When, therefore, evil days fell upon the monarchy, and the country was overrun by Scythian hordes from the north, the Assyrian army was no longer able to withstand them. The troops which had garrisoned the subject provinces of the empire were recalled home, but they did not prove sufficient to defend even Assyria itself. The Assyrian empire fell because the population which had created and maintained it was exhausted. The Assyrian stock practically became extinct, the Assyrian cities became heaps of ruins, and new races occupied their sites. In this respect Assyria offered a conspicuous contrast to Babylonia. There the population continued unchanged in spite of revolution and foreign conquest. Dynasties and empires might rise and fall ; but the people of the country still cultivated their fields or plied their trade and commerce as they had done centuries before. An agricultural population survives, while a military caste which governs by the sword is sure in the course of time to vanish away.

II.—How the People Lived.

Babylonia was the land of bricks, Assyria of stone. It was in Babylonia that the great tower had been built of brick whose head, it was intended, should " reach to heaven." The bricks were merely dried in the sun ; it was but rarely that they were baked in the kiln. When it was wished to give additional solidity to the walls of a building, lighted fuel was piled up against them, and their surfaces were thus vitrified into a solid mass. But usually the Babylonian builders were content with the ordinary sun-dried brick of the country. Naturally it crumbled away in the course of time, and the brick structure became a mound of shapeless mud. Nebuchadnezzar tells us how the great Temple of the Seven Planets of Heaven and Earth at Borsippa, near Babylon, whose ruins are now known under the name of the Birs-i-Nimrud, and which has often been identified with the Tower of Babel, had been destroyed before his time by rain and storm and neglect to repair its drains. In fact the plain of Babylonia was covered with artificial hills formed of the *débris* of ancient temples which had been allowed to fall into decay. One of the earliest names given to it on the monuments is that of " the land of mounds."

No stone was found in the country. If stone was used, as, for instance, by Nebuchadnezzar in his construction of the quays of Babylon, it had to be brought from the distant mountains of Elam. Even the smallest stones and pebbles were highly prized. Hence it was that in Babylonia the art of engraving gems seems to have taken its rise. We learn from Herodotus that every Babylonian carried about with him an engraved seal attached to his wrist by a cord, and the statement is fully confirmed by the native monuments. The seal was of cylindrical shape, pierced longitudinally by a hole through which the cord was passed. When it was needed to be used, it was rolled over the wet clay which served the Babylonians as a writing material, and it was regarded as the necessary guarantee of the owner's identity. No legal deed or contract was valid without the impression of the seals belonging to the persons who took part in it ; the engraved stone, in fact, was as indispensable to its owner as his name itself.

In Assyria, on the contrary, clay was comparatively scarce, and stone was plentiful. Hence, while the temples and palaces of Babylonia were built of brick, those of Assyria were, at all events in part, built of stone. The Assyrians, however, had originally migrated from Babylonia, and they carried with them the tradition of the art and architecture of their mother-country. Accordingly while making use of stone they nevertheless did not altogether forego the use of brick. The walls of Nineveh, in spite of their height, were constructed of brick, and it was only the basement of the palaces which was made of stone. We need not be surprised at this slavish imitation of a style of building which was out of place in the country to which it was transferred. In another respect the Assyrians imitated the architecture of Babylonia even more slavishly and needlessly. This was in the construction of vast platforms of brick, upon which the temples of the gods and the palaces of the kings were erected. In Babylonia such platforms were necessary in order to secure the edifices upon them from the danger of floods or the inconveniences of a marshy soil. But in Assyria similar precautions were not required. There the buildings could have been raised on a foundation of rock, without the intervention of an artificial platform.

The brick walls of the Babylonian houses were covered with stucco, which was then adorned with painting. Dados ran around them, whereon were depicted the figures of men and animals. In the Assyrian palaces the dado was formed of sculptured slabs of stone, and painted in imitation of the dados of painted stucco which were usual in Babylonia. The cornices and other portions of the walls were in the houses of the wealthy often ornamented with bronze and alabaster, and even gold. At times ivory was used for the same purpose as in the ivory palaces of Samaria (Amos iii. 15 ; comp. Ps. xlv.

8). The doors more especially were overlaid with bands of bronze, and were frequently double, the hinges revolving in sockets of bronze. The windows were protected from the weather by means of curtains of tapestry, and a flight of steps, open to the air, led to the upper stories of the house. The steps opened upon a court around which the sitting-rooms and bed-chambers were built, the apartments assigned to the women being kept separate from those of the men.

All these luxuries, however, were confined to the rich and noble. The mass of the people lived like their descendants to-day in mud cabins, with conical roofs of clay. They had to be content to live on the ground-floor, and to exclude the cold and rains of winter, not with costly tapestries, but by making the apertures in the walls which served as windows as small as possible. It is needless to say that the bronze and sculpture and painting which adorned the habitations of the wealthy were unknown in those of the poor.

Even in the houses of the wealthy the furniture was doubtless as scanty and simple as it is still to-day in the East. Rugs of variegated patterns were laid upon the floor, and chairs and stools of various shapes and sizes were used. The stools were generally lofty, so that the feet of the sitter had to be supported on a footstool. Some of the chairs were provided with arms.

At times, instead of chairs, couches or divans were employed. The luxurious Assyrian would even recline on a couch when eating, a habit which passed from the East to Greece, and from Greece to Rome, so that in the days of our Saviour it was more customary to "recline" than to sit at meat. One of the bas-reliefs in the British Museum represents the Assyrian king Assur-bani-pal, lying on a couch while he drinks wine and feasts after the defeat and death of his Elamite enemy, though his wife, who participates in the banquet, is seated on a chair. The custom of reclining at meals was doubtless borrowed by the Assyrians from Babylonia, since the older native fashion was to seat the guests at a dinner party on lofty stools on either side of a small table. At night the wealthier classes slept on bedsteads covered with thick mattresses or rugs. Poorer people were satisfied with the mattress only, which was spread upon the ground and rolled up when no longer needed for use. It was a bed which could be taken up and carried away like the "beds" we read of in the New Testament. All classes alike slept in their ordinary clothes.

The house of the well-to-do Assyrian or Babylonian was not considered complete unless it was provided with a garden or plantation, which, it would seem, was usually planted in front of it. It was well stocked with trees, among which the palm naturally held a chief place. In warm weather tables and seats were placed under the shade of the trees, and meals were thus taken in the open air. Those who could afford to keep slaves for the purpose employed one of them in waving a large fan in order to drive insects away while the meal was being enjoyed. In taking the lease of a house, the tenant usually agreed to keep the garden in order and to replace any trees that might die or be cut down.

The garden was irrigated from one of the numerous canals which intersected the whole of Babylonia. The rich employed hired labourers for the purpose; the poor had to irrigate their own plot of ground. The water was drawn up in buckets and then poured into a number of rivulets which ran through the garden. Vegetables of all kinds were grown along the edges of the rivulets, more especially onions and garlic. It would appear that flowers also were cultivated, at all events in the gardens of the wealthy, since vases of flowers were placed on the tables at a banquet.

The costume of the people was as varied as it is in the modern European world. Old lists of clothing have come down to us which contain as large an assortment of different dresses and their materials as could be found in a shop of to-day. Among the materials may be mentioned the *sindhu*, or muslin of "India," which is described as being composed of "vegetable wool," or cotton, and so bears testimony to an ancient trade between Chaldea and the western coast of India. Most of the stuffs, however, were of home manufacture, and were exported into all parts of the civilized world. It will be remembered that among the Canaanitish spoil found in the tent of Achan was "a goodly Babylonish garment" (Josh. vii. 21).

In spite of the changes of fashion and the varieties of dress worn by different classes of persons, the principal constituents of the Assyrian and Babylonian costume remained the same. These were a hat or head-dress, a tunic or shirt, and a long outer robe which reached to the ankles. In early Babylonian times the hat was ornamented with ribbons which projected before and behind like horns; at a later period it assumed the shape of a tiara or peaked helmet. The material of which it was composed was thick and sometimes quilted; the upper classes further protected their heads from the sun by a parasol, which in Assyria became the symbol of royal or semi-royal authority. The tunic was of linen or wool, the latter material being much employed, particularly in cold weather; it reached half-way down the thigh, and was fastened round the waist by a girdle. A second tunic was often worn under the first, doubtless during the winter season.

The long robe or cloak was specially characteristic of the Babylonians. It opened in front, was usually sleeveless, and was ornamented at the edge with fringes. In walking it allowed the inner side of the left leg to be exposed. Not unfrequently the girdle was fastened round it instead of round the tunic. In Assyria the king sometimes wore over his robe a sort of chasuble, richly ornamented like the robe itself.

The Babylonian priest was characterized by a curious kind of flounced dress which descended to the feet and perhaps was made of muslin. From immemorial times a goat-skin was also flung over his shoulders, the goat being accounted an animal of peculiar sanctity. On Babylonian cylinders and seals a priest may always be at once distinguished by the flounces of his dress.

The costume of the women differed externally but little from that of the men, at least when the latter were dressed in their outer robe. The queen of Assur-bani-pal is depicted in a long unsleeved robe, over which comes a fringed frock reaching below the knees, and over that again a light cape, also fringed and patterned with rosettes. On her feet are boots, and around her head is a crown or fillet representing a castellated wall and thus resembling the mural crown of Greek sculpture. Earrings, bracelets and a necklace complete her costume.

Earrings, bracelets and necklaces were also worn by the men. Anklets are referred to in the inscriptions as well as finger-rings, though the usual substitute for a finger-ring was the cylinder, which, as has already been stated, was attached by a string or chain to the wrist.

The Babylonian, at any rate in earlier times, seems ordinarily to have gone barefooted. Already in the twelfth century B.C., however, we find the king[*] wearing a pair of soft leather shoes, and in Assyria sandals were in use from an early period, the sandal being furnished with a cap for protecting the heel. The northern conquests of Tiglathpileser III. and Sargon introduced the laced boot of the inhabitants of the colder regions in the north. The cavalry, who had hitherto ridden with bare legs, now adopted high boots, laced in front, and worn over tightly fitting breeches of plaited leather. Certain of the foot-soldiers were also clothed in the same way; while others of them wore the boots without the trousers. Sennacherib was the first of the Assyrian kings who discarded the sandal in his own person and substituted for it a shoe, which, like the military boot, was laced in front.

It must not be imagined that the robe or even the tunic was always worn. In fact the light-armed troops in the Assyrian army were contented with a simple kilt, which, together with a felt skull-cap, constituted the whole of their dress. This was also the costume of the Babylonian labourer when working in the fields, and both Assyrians and Babylonians while engaged in manual work or military operations discarded the long and inconvenient outer robe. It was only the upper classes who could afford the luxury of wearing it in every-day life. So, too, the use of a hat or cap was not universal. Numbers of people were satisfied with tying up their hair with a fillet or string, even when exposed to the heat of the sun. At times even the fillet was dispensed with.

The hair of the head was worn long, and the Assyrians distinguished themselves from their neighbours by dressing and curling both it and their beards. The fashion must have been derived from the early Semitic population of Babylonia, since the hero of the great Chaldean epic is represented on ancient engraved seals with a curled beard. On the other hand, the practice was unknown to the non-Semitic population of the country; the sculptured heads, for instance, found at Tel-loth, which belong to the Accado-Sumerian epoch, are either beardless or else provided with long uncurled beards which terminate in a point, "the musked and curled Assyrian bull," spoken of by Lord Tennyson, being a Semitic creation. Here, as elsewhere, fashion was determined by physical characteristics, and it was only among a Semitic people distinguished by its thick growth of black hair that the art of the hair-dresser could develop as it did in Semitic Babylonia and Assyria. The comparatively beardless Sumerians rather encouraged the barber, who accordingly occupies a conspicuous place in early Babylonian literature.

---

[*] Merodach-nadin-akhi, B.C. 1106. He has on his head a tall square cap, ornamented in front with a band of rosettes immediately above the forehead, while a row of feathers in an upright position runs round the top. It is curious that a similar head-dress was worn by the Zakkur, who are usually identified with the Teukrians, and are among the foreign enemies depicted upon the Egyptian monuments.

THE MINISTRY REQUIRED BY THE AGE.*

BY R. W. DALE, LL.D.

From *The British Weekly* (Nonconformist), London, November 6, 1890.

It is among our traditional usages that when a minister is ordained to his first pastorate a sermon is preached to the church and a solemn charge is delivered to the minister. This, however, is not an ordination but a recognition service. Dr. Goodrich has had a long experience of the duties and responsibilities of the ministry, and he has discharged them honourably. He has drawn to himself the love and confidence of the Congregational Churches, both of England and Scotland. He knows already far better than I can tell him the sorrows of the ministry, its labours, its perils, its anxieties, and its joys. He knows the eternal fountains of light, of consolation and of strength. Dr. Maclaren will address the Church, but it would be singularly presumptuous if I were to attempt to address to your minister anything of the nature of a charge. I can but express my affection for him, and the earnest hope that the large success of his ministry in this place will more than justify his retirement from the great position which he held in Glasgow.

Though I cannot deliver a charge, I have been requested to speak on a subject which might, perhaps, in hands strong enough to deal with it, suggest the materials for a charge—*The ministry required by the present age.*

The subject is not of my selection, nor are the terms in which it is defined. I have no liking for subjects of this description—so large, so far-reaching. Their horizons are too remote. Their limits escape me. They are beyond my strength. And yet, since I have been asked to speak on this subject, I will do what I can.

But to discuss it at all, I must dismiss, at starting, a very large part of the life and work of the minister, and limit myself to his preaching; and to discuss even this province of the subject to any good purpose, I must think of you—the Church and the congregation—rather than of the minister. For you have very much more to do with the substance and with the form of your minister's sermons than you probably suspect. When the eye is dim and the tongue falters and becomes indistinct in its utterance, the cause of the evil is not always to be found in the eye itself, or in the tongue itself; the root of the mischief may be in some remote organ of the body, or in a deficiency of general constitutional vigour. And the Church is a living body. If the minister does a great deal to form the life and determine the work of the congregation, the congregation does a great deal to form the life and determine the work of the minister. The strong currents of thought and feeling which are flowing in the congregation may carry him, without his knowing it, several points to the east or the west when he is steering due north or south, and he may get on to dangerous rocks; or they may add, without his knowing it, to the speed which he is making on the right course. A strong and conscientious man, loyal to Christ, looking forward to that awful hour when he must give account of his ministry, will never try to preach so as to *please* his people; the more he loves them the less will he try to please them merely: but their conception of the kind of preaching which they really need will have a large influence on his own thoughts of how he ought to preach. It is my belief that when churches have discovered what are the true elements of power in a minister, and, disregarding all inferior and adventitious attractions, care supremely for what is supremely worth caring for, they will have a powerful ministry.

I.

What, then, should you desire in your minister's preaching? And, more definitely, how should you wish the Present Age—of which my subject requires me to think—to affect his preaching?

In answering these questions it is necessary, first of all, to grasp very firmly a very obvious and commonplace truth:—Your minister is a *Christian* minister: as a preacher he is a preacher of the Christian Gospel. The Christian Gospel was given to men by the Lord Jesus Christ, and those whom He commissioned to unfold its contents. It has been verified in the experience of the Christian Church, an experience which now extends over more than eighteen hundred years. You yourselves constitute a Christian Church, and are the heirs, trustees, and defenders of the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints. To you the ultimate secret of the life of man, and of that divine and eternal order in which man stands has been revealed; you are not voyaging across unknown seas of thought in order to discover it. Your minister, therefore, has not to receive a revelation from the new age in which we are living; he has a revelation to deliver to it—a revelation from God—a revelation which is at once old and new; old as the sun and stars which have been the wonder and delight of men from the beginning; new as that fresh and immediate vision of sun and stars which comes to the men of every new generation. We have something more than a tradition or an historic record of these celestial glories; we have seen them for ourselves, and can speak of them at first hand; and yet they are the same that shone above Chaldean shepherds and the builders of the pyramids. The Christian Gospel is the Gospel of Christ, of Paul, of John, of Peter, of James.

---

* Address prepared for the service at Chorlton-road Congregational church, Manchester, Nov. 3, 1890. The first part here given was omitted in delivery.

To include its infinite contents within the limits of a few sentences is impossible; they are inexhaustible. But it is clear that the Christian Gospel assumes that man was created to share the life, and the righteousness, and the blessedness of the Eternal; that he has fallen short of this great glory; has fallen short of it by sin, has incurred guilt, and therefore needs the divine forgiveness. The Christian Gospel also assumes that the moral and spiritual perfection of man cannot be attained by the development and discipline of any powers in man himself, but only by the inspiration of the spirit of God with whose grace man has freely to co-operate.

Is there anything in these assumptions to suggest an answer to our questions as to the Ministry required by our Age? I think there is.

(1) These assumptions are categorically denied by certain theories of human life, which have been fighting hard for ascendancy during the last thirty or forty years; and, what is more important, the convictions on which the assumptions rest are enfeebled by the general spirit and temper of our contemporaries.

For example, the doctrine of heredity, as it is very commonly held, is much more fatal to the sense of personal responsibility for life and conduct than the old doctrine of Original Sin, as it was commonly held by persons who professed the Calvinistic theology. The theory of the power of environment, and especially of the social environment, over the personal life is more fatal to the sense of moral freedom than the Calvinistic doctrine of the Divine decrees. Just at the time when Calvinism had been very generally surrendered by the Churches, its least noble elements were reasserted by the philosophers. The philosophers have picked up fragments of the creed which the theologians had cast aside—and the worst fragments. For what is the theory of human nature which includes the ethical and spiritual life of man within the region of natural law but a theory of Necessity? And the philosophical theory of Necessity is Calvinism without a God. The greatness of God, Who to the Calvinist was a Living Person—a Living Person with an infinite love of righteousness and an infinite hatred of moral evil—with a Free Will, supreme, unbound by any authority beyond itself—the greatness of God, I say, as a Living Person, with transcendent moral perfection, appealed to the personality of a devout Calvinist, and to all the most robust elements of his moral life. In the presence of an unconscious Necessity human freedom is crushed; in the presence of an august Person, though unlimited powers over all created things are in theory attributed to Him, human freedom rises to heroic energy, and becomes capable of heroic achievements.

(2) It is not only the drift of scientific thought that enfeebles the sense of moral freedom and moral responsibility. Large numbers of people have just discovered the sins of *Society*, and in the freshness of their penitence are declaring that Society, and Society alone, is responsible for the wickedness and misery of individual men. Create, they say, a new and just and gracious social order, and the wilderness will blossom as the rose; the vices of men will vanish; all men will be virtuous: Society, not the individual, is responsible for the lying and the lust, the dishonesty, the cruelty, the selfishness, and the ambition of mankind.

These conceptions of human life strike at the very root of the assumptions of the Christian Gospel. The Christian minister, if he is to be successful in drawing men to Christ, must take account of them. That there is a measure of truth in them is certain, but the most fatal falsehoods are precisely those which are not wholly false; the truth which is in them is largely the secret of their power.

The Christian minister, in our time, has to consider how with God's help he can awaken that sense of personal responsibility which has been drugged by poisonous theories of life, and stifled by an atmosphere which is heavy and foul.

He may sometimes make an intellectual assault on the theories which are working the mischief, but his real success will come from other methods. He himself must have an awful sense of the *guilt*—not merely the *evil*—of sin; he must be vividly conscious of his own personal responsibility, and then there will be a wholesome, stimulating power in the masculine energy of his own moral life ; virtue will go out of him. He must recur again and again to those lines of thought and appeal to which the normal conscience of every man is most likely to respond.

He must rouse it to condemn with fierce indignation the crimes of other men ; and while it is all aglow must turn the fires against the man's own sins. He must never forget that he has an ally in every man's heart—imprisoned, chained, its force broken, its eye dim, its voice feeble—but alive still, and still capable of giving answers to any message in which there is the accent of God.

He must insist on the true nature of sin as a crime deserving punishment—not merely a disease requiring to be cured ; as an offence needing pardon—not merely a calamity like blindness, needing pity. He must bring home to every man his own part in determining his conduct, and not suffer it to be supposed that character is wholly the creation of birth and circumstances. While frankly recognizing those regions of human life which are within the dominion of necessity, he must insist on the reality and awful dignity of that inner sanctuary which is the province of freedom. He must distinguish between the circumstances and occasions which make it *possible* for a man to sin—the pressure of forces both within and without which *move* him to sin—and his own consent to sin. He must show that the social order cannot be held responsible for the vices and irreligion of large numbers of our people, while there are large numbers who are in exactly the same social condition living an honest, upright, temperate, and Christian life. He must appeal to the judgment to come, and to its awful, its glorious issues.

You must not suppose that your minister has forgotten the temper and requirements of the age if he insists on these austere aspects of truth. They are in my judgment precisely what the age requires to inspire it with a more masculine and robust moral temper, and to induce it to listen to the Christian Gospel.

(3) Closely associated with the tendencies of modern thought and feeling of which I have just spoken is the demand for a social order based upon the principles of the Sermon on the Mount.

I may say, in passing, that it seems to be very generally forgotten that the precepts of that discourse are addressed to the disciples of Christ, and that they are intended to regulate their conduct as citizens of the Kingdom of God—their conduct toward each other, and their conduct toward other men. There is nothing in them which directly illustrates Christ's conception of the State. Elsewhere in the New Testament there is an explicit application of the Christian law to political life. As citizens of the Kingdom of God we are bound to feel no resentment against those who injure us, and not to avenge ourselves. But are grave offences to go unpunished? That is not the Christian idea. " Avenge not yourselves, beloved . . . . vengeance belongeth to me ; I will recompense, saith the Lord." It is *our* blessedness to be called to show mercy and pity even to those who do us great wrongs ; the penalty of the wrongs—if they are not repented of and forgiven—God Himself will inflict. And in the social order these penalties are to be inflicted in God's name by judges and magistrates. For " the powers that be are ordained of God." The earthly ruler " beareth not the sword in vain, for he is a minister of God ; an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil." Human life, under its present earthly conditions, approaches the Christian ideal when no personal resentments are felt against those who injure us, but when all offences against individuals or the State are equitably punished by the magistrates. Mercy is the great duty of the private citizen ; of the magistrate, justice.

But this by the way. The great thing to insist upon is that a Christian social order is impossible except to a Christian people. The arrangement proper to a college for young men would be mischievous in a school for boys. Institutions which are foreign to the spirit and character of a nation can have no real authority ; they will not work. Between the political and economic order on the one hand, and the temper and moral habits of a people on the other, the relations are vital. As long as the great desire of large numbers of our people is for material prosperity, a social order which is in harmony with the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount is impossible. Men must seek first —as the supreme object of life—the Kingdom of God and His righteousness before they can have an economic organization of society corresponding to the spirit and laws of Christ.

What, then, is a Christian minister to do in the presence of the demand that the whole force of the Church should be used in promoting urgent social reforms? Is he to avoid in the pulpit and elsewhere all those questions which in many noble hearts are creating a passionate enthusiasm? Is he to do nothing toward improving the material conditions of human life, and to be content with speaking of things eternal and divine? I do not believe that you will try to impose on your minister any such restraints.

You should, I think, wish him to remember the historic conditions under which the successive changes of the economic order of Christendom have occurred. They have been the results—in many cases the wholly unforeseen results—of new forces which have acted on the intellectual and moral life of nations; or of great geographical discoveries; or of great inventions. They have not been the fulfilment of the programme of any social reformers. The results—the beneficent results—of the partial triumphs of the Christian Faith in Europe—and let it never be forgotten that its triumphs have been very partial—were not foreseen by the Apostles and the early generations of their converts. Aided by economic forces it abolished the institution of slavery; but that it would have this effect was neither intended from the beginning nor foreseen. Nor was the change it has effected in the position of women intended or foreseen; nor the results—partly beneficent, partly disastrous—which have come from making pity and compassion for the poor a form of religious service. The leaven worked; no one foresaw how it would work.

Take another illustration. The results of the immense triumph of the principle of Individualism in France in the last century were neither intended nor foreseen. Great evils were swept away by the Revolution; but within a century, evils—new in their form and new in their magnitude—have sprung up in the place of those which have disappeared, and these are so great that the tide of a strong reaction is running to flood, and many compassionate men are crying out earnestly for the restoration of restraints on individual freedom—restraints differing in kind for the most part from those which were removed—but still restraints; and yet the dissolution of these restraints was one of the chief ends and glories of the Revolution. The leaders of the Revolution did not intend or foresee the results of their work.

I do not believe in large schemes for changing the whole order, either of our political or economical life. If I am asked to accept a scheme and to work for it, which would transfer all the materials and instruments of production to the State, and am assured that only by such a revolutionary method as this can the miseries of considerable masses of the people be removed, I am obliged to reply that the conditions which determine the economical prosperity of nations are so complex that I have not the confidence and the courage to determine whether such an immense reconstruction would on the whole be beneficial; that the equation contains so many unknown quantities that I cannot solve it; that the greatest and most beneficent improvements in the social and economic condition of nations have not hitherto been the working out of a complete and systematic theory of the true social and economic order; that, judging from experience, the destruction of our present organization and the attempt to reconstruct our economic life on the principles of Collectivism would not work, as its promoters anticipate, and that very possibly the evil results would greatly outweigh the good.

And if I am told that the Christian faith is irrevocably pledged to the cause of justice and mercy, and that while the social order is unjust and unmerciful, Christian men are unfaithful to Christ if they do not attempt to reform it, I answer, Yes; but I must first be sure that the new order would be more just and more merciful than the old, and that the methods proposed for abolishing the old order would at the same time provide for the secure establishment of the new. And the *first* object of the Christian faith is not to secure justice and mercy in social institutions, but to make Christian men merciful and just. It does not wait till the social order is Christian before it requires and enables Christian men to obey the law and illustrate the spirit of Christ. It has required and enabled men to love and honour each other as brethren under social conditions wholly antagonistic to the spirit of human brotherhood.

The law was imperative in the old Roman times on masters and slaves; in mediæval times on lord and serf; and with the law power was given to fulfil it. It was by the assertion and partial fulfilment of the law under these adverse conditions that conditions more favourable to the true *idea* of human life were rendered possible. In our own days the same law is imperative and the same grace is given. It requires employers to care for their men in the spirit of Christ, and men to care for their employers in the spirit of Christ. It says to both, Seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. It requires, as I have sometimes said, the tradesman, the manufacturer, the merchant to carry on his business under the competitive organization of modern industry as *if Christ were the Head of* *the firm.* It requires the clerk, the manager, the foreman, the workman, the porter, the errand boy to do his part as *if Christ were the Head of the firm,* "as unto the Lord, not unto men." It offers power to all of them to enable them to do it. And we should desire that the more merciful and equitable social order to which the present is only a transition should come as the natural result of a great change in the temper and character of the nation; should be the new and outward sign of a new and invisible grace; should come, not from the outbreak of the passions of men violently demanding a larger share of the material prosperity of the world for themselves, but as an achievement of that love which "suffereth long and is kind," "envieth not," "seeketh not its own."

Meanwhile every change in methods of production and distribution which promises to lessen the suffering and the precariousness of human life, to add to it ease, security, comfort, and brightness—whatever can lessen the fierceness of social and economic conflict and bind together not one class of the community as an organized army to fight another—but all classes of the community as a brotherhood for the welfare and safety of all; every social reform which can raise the dignity of the less fortunate of the people, and induce the wealthy and the powerful to discharge their responsibilities and duties, should be sustained, and heartily sustained, by every man that desires to see the will of God done on earth as it is done in heaven.

Some of these proposals may be so manifestly reasonable and practicable that you may wish your minister to advocate them in this place; with regard to others, about whose reasonableness and practicability men of clear intelligence and of a just and generous spirit may be doubtful you will prefer that he should be silent. But if the great hindrance of all economic and social reforms lies in human selfishness, in the passion for material prosperity, in the spirit of ambition, whether it is the ambition of a man for himself, or his ambition for his family, or his ambition for the class to which he belongs, the ministry of the Gospel in this place, if it is penetrated with the spirit of Christ, will render the kind of aid which is most necessary to every movement for improving the condition of the people, and in many cases the aid will be most effectively rendered to movements which are not explicitly advocated, and about whose wisdom your minister himself may be uncertain. The good leaven will work, and will work in ways which he neither intends nor foresees.

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL OLD CATHOLIC CONGRESS.

Held at Cologne, September 12th–14th, 1890.

BY MADAME HYACINTHE LOYSON.

From *The Independent*, New York, October 23, 1890.

This was the tenth National Congress of the Old Catholics of Germany—the first International—and is not only an important historical event in the Church, but is the signal departure in the inevitable Restoration of Catholic Faith. This Congress, long waited for, was well prepared and well attended by representatives of all the Old Catholics from the West and some from the East — Holland, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, France, Austria, Spain, England. America and Russia. There were many distinguished and leading men—divines, savants and statesmen; but the central figures, and object, of the most intense interest, were three small, modest Dutchmen—the Archbishop of Utrecht and the Bishops of Deventer and Haarlem. But why was there so much importance attached to these three modest men? Because they compose the uncontested and incontestable Episcopate of the Occident in opposition to that of Rome.

We will recall here, in a few words, how this Church in Holland came to exist, and also explain how and why we Gallicans are their close kin.

In the seventeenth century, when the spirit of the Reformation was abroad among the Christians of Europe, there was a very decided movement in France and simultaneously in Holland.

St. Cyran was the promoter in France, and the founder of Port Royal, that eminent school of French theologians and philosophers who have left to posterity one of the most glorious records of Catholic faith in the history of the Church. At the same time Jansenius, in Holland, a friend of St. Cyran, took his stand against the pernicious adulteration of the faith by the Jesuits. The bull *Unigenitus* (in 1713), by Clement XI., was the climax of papal encroachment upon Christian conscience, and may be said to be the principal pivot of the first Old Catholic movement—the separation of the Dutch Church from Rome.

Bossuet, Fénélon, Pascal, and the Arnaulds, disciples of St. Cyran, were the great leaders of the school which took its name from the Monastery of Port Royal, which was their centre. This was situated in the country about fifteen miles from Paris, and had for its abbess that remarkable and saintly woman, sister of the Arnaulds, the Mère Angelique.

While they never sought nor would have accepted any rupture with the Holy See, to which institution they claimed allegiance, but whose occupant they could not always claim as the representative of their faith, they became the open enemies of the Jesuits and the steadfast opponents of the encroaching papacy. How heroically and at what cost they defended their Gallican liberties, history has recorded; and the defeat of these noble men and women makes up one of the saddest but most glorious pages. The women were scattered, the men were exiled, the monastery and their church were razed to the ground, and Louis XIV. could only be satisfied that their extirpation was complete, when he drove the ploughshare across the ground where these edifices had stood, and through the sacred precincts, turning up to the accusing light of Heaven, the bones of these holy women. They are dead—nearly two centuries ago; their outraged bones have become dust; but their ideas live and their works do follow them; and we Gallicans, or Old Catholics of France, are their children; and I am not afraid to say that we shall march into the twentieth century not unworthy of such parentage. During these days of persecution in France the Jesuits were at work in Holland.

The great Arnauld, who was the leader of the anti-Jesuit party at Port Royal, had always dreamed of founding a colony in Holland, attracted thither by the friendship of Van Neercassel, who was at the same time papal nuncio in those countries, Bishop of Castoria and Archbishop of Utrecht, a holy and learned prelate and highly esteemed by Bossuet, the great French bishop, whose writings stand to-day as first authority in Christian philosophy and doctrine. The questions between the combatants were dogmatic. The Archbishop of Utrecht wrote and spoke to immense crowds with great eloquence upon divine love and the necessity of repentance. Jansenius defended with other extreme doctrines that of Irresistible Grace and Absolute Election or Rejection. The Dutch Church, with entire reason, repudiates the name of "Jansenist," which is often given it.

The conscience of Dutchmen resembles the mighty dikes of their country; their resistance to the swelling ocean of Ultramontanism was steady and long. The Popes had been furious with their bulls and decrees, but the irate Pontiffs had no *Grand Monarque* for accomplice to scatter these sturdy men or plough them under; and, thank God! they are still holding out and are to-day our fathers—fathers of the Gallican Church, and the Central See of the true Catholic Church in the West. They have maintained uninterruptedly the Apostolic Succession, in the persons of an archbishop and two bishops. In witness of their continued acceptation of the hierarchical central See they have, through all these years, advised the Pope, in the most courteous manner, of the election of each new Bishop —His Holiness, in reply, always sending back a bull of excommunication! This formality, however, was discontinued in 1853, when Pius IX. sent two bishops (*motu proprio ex plenitudine potestatis apostolicæ*) to the Roman Catholics in Holland, whom Jesuitism had succeeded in detaching from the old national edifice—that which is to-day represented by the three bishops at the Old Catholic Congress in Cologne. That Church, founded in the fifth century by St. Willibrord and St. Boniface, both English bishops, counted three hundred thousand opposed to Rome at the time of the separation. Roman propagandism, on the one hand, and Dutch inertia on the other, have dwindled that number to seven thousand; but when we remember how the grain of wheat found in the crisped hand of the mummified Pharaoh, borne into light and cast into soil, has to-day for its progeny thousands and tens of thousands of acres of waving grain, on the vast prairies of America and sweeping steppes of Asia, we are encouraged to press forward in spite of all difficulties. It is principle and not numbers that wins in the long battle. Then we are on the side of the great majority when we are on the side of God, and we are convinced that the Dutch Church, coming out of her sarcophagus of the seventeenth century, has need of the light of the closing nineteenth century and the Old Catholic soil of to-day, and will be led to open a new and large fold for the upbuilding of many churches and the refuge of immortal souls. It numbers at present thirty parishes; possesses a theological seminary at Amersfoort, which takes highest rank in learning and Christian excellence, besides a college or smaller seminary, and is recognized by the government. If in their jealous and timid isolation the Dutch Catholics have not kept pace with the century, they have unmistakably retained what, alas! is sadly lacking to-day in most of the churches, austere morals and unswerving faith.

The Old Catholics who separated from Rome after the Vatican Council, maintained the integral faith of the ancient Church, and retain its government also—the Historical Episcopate. Once separated from the Papal See, their great anxiety was to secure these two essentials, and the maintenance of the faith was less difficult than that of the episcopate; for the law of God remains unchanged in his written Word, and the doctrine of the undivided Church is written in the decisions of the early and truly ecumenical councils. To retain undisputed apostolic succession was, consequently, of paramount importance. But as God's promise to the faithful holds good throughout all difficulties and all time—"Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world!"—so there appeared in the midst of our dilemma a rock of salvation—the faithful Church in Holland. Direct Succession could have been obtained from the Greek Church, or the Coptic, or the Anglican, or from some of the ancient Churches in Asia; but the Greek Church presented too many apparent and only apparent difficulties. The Coptic Episcopate is desert-bound in the heart of Africa, and the Anglicans are too much entangled with the State. To this Church, therefore, the first German Old Catholic bishop, Rienkens, was sent for consecration, who in turn consecrated Bishop Herzog, of Switzerland.

This is the first time that the bishops of Holland have participated in any Old Catholic Congress. One year ago, however, in September, 1889, the Archbishop of Utrecht convoked Bishop Rienkens and Bishop Herzog, with his Dutch *confrère,* to a conference in his arch-episcopal residence, and the result was a ready and perfect understanding that henceforth all Episcopal measures taken by them in the interest of Old Catholicism, should be with the unanimous concurrence of these five bishops.

We believe the time is not far distant when France, Austria, Italy and Spain will each have their regularly organized Old Catholic Churches. As we French people never do things by halves, when we began the Old Catholic movement eleven years ago, having no synod but our conscience, no tribunal but that of God, we inaugurated those reforms which we felt were essential. We have been not only violently attacked by our enemies, but also blamed by some of our friends as going too fast. At first the Dutch Church looked askance; but we are happy to say that they are coming, though very slowly, to the front of action; and that the reforms that we Gallicans began alone are to-day officially accepted by the five bishops, and practised more or less throughout all the Old Catholic churches of Europe.

The most remarkable features of the Congress were the absence of all dogmatic discussions, the broad, Christian charity evinced during all its sessions, and the undisguised and happy fraternity between all its members. Besides the two hundred official delegates, there were representatives from the Greek Church in the person of the Chaplain and Confessor of the Czar of Russia and other priests of the Oriental Church, who cordially greeted the two Anglican Bishops, Jenner and Salisbury. As an instance of the perfect liberty as well as the fraternity of the Congress, I may be allowed to quote a word from one of the speeches made by Père Hyacinthe, which elicited the most enthusiastic applause and the warmest congratulations. He said:

> "I read the other day, upon the tomb of your illustrious Stein, the first reconstructer of Prussia, this inscription: 'Unhumiliated Son of the Humiliated Fatherland.' These words could have been our device the day after Sedan, as they were his the day after Jena. But to-day, after twenty years of courageous and fruitful effort, after our centenary of 1789 and our Universal Exposition, we can say 'Sons—confident and proud of the *patrie* lifted up again!'"

Distinguished Protestants also were present, and one, Professor Nippold, of Jena, delivered a most stirring address in favor of the Old Catholic movement. There were most devout religious services at the two Old Catholic churches in Cologne. Then there were lunches and banquets, some of which, with the speeches and toasts, lasted four hours with unabated interest. It was resolved to hold henceforth a like International Congress every two years—that of next year to be in Switzerland.

When we remember the small beginning of the Christian Church after all the preaching of the twelve Apostles, and above all that of the Divine Master; and after all his healing and miracles, and the multitudes which followed him, and after his glorious crucifixion—only one hundred and twenty!—surely we have reason to be encouraged. for we are legion.

Cologne was very beautiful as we viewed it for the last time in the sunset from the steamer's deck on the great river; and when, as the twilight deepened and the soft, deep tones of vesper-bells swung out from the high cathedral towers, around which all the other myriad spires and steeples seemed to incline as in devotion, we felt that it was rightly named the "Holy City of the Rhine."

PARIS, October 3, 1890.

BISHOP HUNTINGTON ON "SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND THE CHURCH."

From *The Churchman* (Episcopal), New York, November 8, 1890.

THE October number of the *Forum* contains several notable articles, among which the most remarkable is one by the Bishop of Central New York under the caption "Social Problems and the Church." We subjoin a condensed abstract of some of the bishop's most striking paragraphs, in the hope that our readers will obtain and carefully consider the whole article as it stands in the *Forum*.

DID CHRIST RECOGNIZE CLASSES?

"Did Christ recognize classes? He recognized them as actual, but not as necessary, or even as legitimate, in the order of society which He came to establish. He did not propose that order as a scheme, but predicted and commanded it as a social reality or kingdom. 'It shall not be so among you,' He said.

"At the same time, there is no denying that this head of a new earth and new heavens did see the two classes which the world had sundered, and that He made His choice between them. Deliberately, emphatically, uniformly, He stood on one side of the dividing line, and placed there the moral foundations of His empire of love. He lived there, sought His companionships and lodgings there, was at home there, bestowed there His honors and benedictions. There is no beatitude that reads, 'Blessed are the rich, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven;' no rule of selection proclaiming, 'I have chosen the rich of this world.' There is no malediction or threat saying, 'Woe unto you poor men, hard-working men, ill-clad men, unlettered men, men that are managed, bought, and sold; men at the mercy of capitalists and corporations; men dictated to, kept down, taken advantage of, with small chance in a lawsuit, or if accused of a theft, forced into a "class" whether you like it or not.' It is all the other way—the whole Gospel, from the lowly yet triumphant *Magnificat* of the virgin mother, to the unbounded and impartial invitation to free waters of eternal life at the end of the Apocalypse. We all know it would not be a Gospel if it were otherwise, but an absurd mockery of a Gospel."

CHURCHES AND CLASSES: A TERRIBLE ARRAIGNMENT.

As operating through human agencies, the Church has an ecclesiastical apparatus, policy, financial system, officers and honors. One of its primary duties in behalf of the unprivileged classes is to see that the array of this machinery allows no favoritism, and that it concedes nothing to the ambition, arrogance, pride of fastidiousness of wealth.

"But more than half the religious organizations, large or small, are at present practical contradictions of the Sermon on the Mount. It does not need an ostentatious hierarchy to open the door for the 'prince of this world,' letting him in where he does tenfold the mischief he could do by persecutions, seductions, or infidel arguments outside. He buys up the property, holds the keys of pew doors, puts rich families in the foremost seats, hires and pays the choir, raises funds by lotteries and theatricals, tells the 'lower classes' to stay out in the streets or patronizes them with a mission chapel in the outskirts, makes a fashion plate of the female worshippers, sees to it that parish offices and all other marks of distinction are assigned to prosperous merchants, politicians, and leaders of society—never to mechanics and day laborers, who have no qualifications except piety and good sense—suits the preacher to the tastes of the ruling set, and 'runs the concern.' What is all this parochial mammonism and snobbery but a surrender of the kingdom of the Crucified to His adversary? Where is the divine brotherhood? Meantime, prudent care is taken to keep the holy language and handsome ceremonial safe, and not to put St. Dives into the calendar."

THE CHURCH AND THE LABOR PROBLEM.

"The Church will do its duty by a generous, and if need be a forbearing, sympathy with the movements and measures, not bearing its name, which are products of the 'labor problem.' They are new to the Church and new to the world. They are almost as unlike as possible to the guilds of the middle ages. They are not political insurrections, and will not be if this duty of the Church is done. They are not communistic phantasies. They have an inherent vitality, a plausible reason, numerical strength, and a spreading activity. They will not be impressed by the intelligence or fairness of one who jumbles them all together under a supercilious sneer—anarchy, socialism, nationalism, municipalism, trades unions, knights of labor, single-tax landownership—as if they were one malign or foolish brood, instead of being quite as unlike one another as the Protestant religious sects. Nor will they be either guided or subdued by petulance. Their fatal inconsistency, their sad incapacity of unification, their pathetic lack of leadership, the Church will look on with pity, not with contempt, if it has the spirit of its shepherd King whom the common people heard gladly. Why does not the Church make itself their leader? If a peer in the House of Lords could say the other day that Christianity is the most perfect system of democracy, why should not organized Christianity prove itself to be that?

"Recent certified revelations have laid bare the multiplied horrors and depravities of the tenement population in great cities, where forty-one out of every hundred families live each in a single room, where the poorest working class are actually made to pay a higher rent, in proportion to income, than those in any other part of the community, and where the poorest pay more rent than the richest for each cubic foot of space and air. These facts put it beyond question that, in the name of a common humanity, and as sure as there is an ethical element in Christianity at all, there are social sins and human equities which have a more urgent and imperative claim on the consideration of ecclesiastical councils and of weekly sermons than any questions of discipline, ritual, hymnology, or predestination.

"An earnest and patient treatment of social wrongs by a wide and large-hearted Church, is as likely as Congress or the courts to heal discontent and to forestall insurrection. Even Mr. Hyndman says: 'However successful a revolution might be, it is certain that mankind cannot change its whole nature at once. Break the old shell certainly, but never forget that the new forms must grow out of the old.'"

THE CRY OF "PESSIMISM!"

"The bad name for a Christian reformer, who naturally begins by pointing out that there is something to be reformed, is 'pessimist.' Pessimism has been known in the history of speculations, ancient and modern. It is the theory that the plan of the universe is bad in itself, and that its ongoings are hopelessly bad, in fact, the worst possible. It is avowed or unavowed atheism. Reformers have no place in it; philanthropists no opportunity; religion no foothold; suffering no hope. The attitude of the Christian prophet, on the other hand, who sees the wrongs and iniquities of society, exposes them in order that they may be remedied, denounces them in the name of Christ, conceals none of them, excuses none, apologizes for none, condones none for the sake of a political or religious party, for secular profit, for a salary or an office—this is the attitude, not of the pessimist, but of the real optimist.

"*Laissez faire* is pessimism. Indiscriminate, stolid conservatism is pessimism. We all know the posture, the calling, the cry, of the Hebrew prophets. Were they pessimists? Was John Baptist a pessimist?"

The Church is nothing if it is not a witness for Him who put Himself at the head of all reformers by confronting the self-satisfied, and by convincing the world that it must be set right because it is so wrong. Better the truth-teller, who uncovers what is bad to turn it into good, than the flatterer, who calls evil good and lets it go from bad to worse.

A KEEN RETORT.

A contributor to the *Forum*, who has taught scholars and thinkers to expect of him a large treatment of grave subjects, in the course of a clever criticism of a popular fiction, drops into this *laissez faire* method.

"'One man is born in an age of barbarism, another in an age of civilization.' But what we are dealing with now is an age, not of barbarism, but of professed civilization; why then should this truism be brought to rebuke an honest novel-writer who is trying to persuade his neighbors to clear out of our civilization, such as it is, a considerable mass of barbarous iniquity incidental to competitive conditions. 'Why,' it is asked, 'is one animal the beast of prey, another the victim?' Nobody can tell, perhaps; but if this striking illustration has any logical pertinency to the argument, it must mean that our social 'beasts of prey,' in speculation and monopoly, are to be let alone and tolerated by their victims and by the lookers-on. 'Why should one sentient creature be a worm and another a man?' This is not the question; but whether, being a man and not a worm, I may treat poorer men of fewer opportunities like worms, and make myself a hawk or a snake, instead of doing my best to get these unprivileged fellow creatures out of the worm condition. 'Health, strength, beauty, intellect, offspring, length of days, are distributed with no more regard for justice than are the powers of making and saving wealth.' Does this mean that no more responsibility attaches to the power of making and saving wealth than to the six preceding advantages? Does it mean that because some men and women are at a disadvantage in respect to those six natural things which they can do little or nothing to change, therefore there are no outrageous wrongs pertaining to the 'powers of making and saving wealth' which conscience and law and society can check, and ought to check, by important measures tending to lessen inequality and to promote justice? 'After all, there is more co-operation than competition in the industrial world as it now exists.' Possibly; but suppose that competition and co-operation come into conflict, as they sometimes do, which will generally go to the wall? Will it be competition? There is a common maxim that 'competition is the life of business.' We understand that; but is that 'business' of the kind that justice and humanity, honor and magnanimity, are most anxious to encourage? 'Neither equal justice nor perfection of any kind is the law of the world, as the world is at present, toward whatever goal we may be moving.' Exactly; but can it not be seen that 'the world, as the world is at present,' is precisely what Christianity and Christ, the Church and the prophet, are on the earth to bring to judgment, righting its wrongs radically if need be, and making it over into a world that shall be in some sense or other the 'kingdom of God'? 'The advantages of combining Mr. Stewart's dry-goods establishment with Mr. Carnegie's iron works are not obvious at all.' Agreed; yet if these establishments should produce their fine industrial and money-making results by a system of labor and wages which should subject a great number of men or women to physical exhaustion, mental starvation, social slavery, or political disability, yielding them less pay than their work is worth, then it must be obvious that they would be out of harmony with the divine order and with the highest interests of mankind."

MEASURES AND METHODS.

"Little is said here about measures or methods. The Church has little to say of them which has not been said from the beginning. These will appear as they are wanted when there are faith and wisdom and will to order and to regulate them. The time has come when workmen ask not charity, but justice; not the property of other men, but their own; God's common gifts to the people for the people's use; nothing more. If strikes and strikers demand more, the Church cannot countenance their demand.

"Quite as little may it be expected, in the face of recent social science and of the labor bureaus of our cities, to encourage soup kitchens, poor laws, the old-time dole, or the distribution of cast-off clothing. It must achieve its gracious ends, if at all, by creating convictions in all classes which will render these unhealthy remedies of an unhealthy condition superfluous, and by allying itself fearlessly with all the restorative forces that are rising into action in the mind and conscience of our time.

"The whole matter is degraded and belittled if we forget that the worst evil, even among the poor, is not their poverty. There must be a higher aspiration and a deeper longing in them and in us, who try to help them, than to obtain an easier lot, more to eat and drink and wear, or more leisure for dissipation, indolence, and amusement. But just as careful ought Christians to be not to act or preach as if having our 'conversation in heaven' were to postpone a heavenly order of society to a future world, instead of setting it up on the earth."

HENRY MARTYN DEXTER.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, November 20, 1890.

THE saddest task which has ever fallen to the editorial staff of this paper is this response to the sudden summons to chronicle the death of its honored and beloved editor-in-chief. The kind "good-night," into which he always put at parting an expression of personal interest in every one in these rooms, still lingers in our ears. It seems impossible to realize that his tall form and strong, alert and pleasant face may not at any moment again look in on us.

Henry Martyn Dexter was born in Plympton, Mass., Aug. 13th, 1821. His father, Rev. Elijah Dexter, was pastor of the Congregational church in that place for forty-four years. His mother was a sister of Governor Marcus Morton. He entered Brown University at fifteen years of age, but finished his academic course at Yale, graduating in 1840. Four years later he graduated from Andover Theological Seminary, and in the same year was settled as the first pastor of the Franklin Street Congregational Church, Manchester, N. H. There he remained till 1849, when he accepted a call to the Pine Street Church, Boston, now Berkeley Temple, succeeding Professor Austin Phelps. He was pastor of that church for eighteen years of continued prosperity. The building on Berkeley Street, having at the time of its completion the largest seating capacity of any church edifice in the city, was planned by him with a view to furnish a church home for the common people.

Though busied with the care of a large and growing parish, early in his ministry he developed a strong liking and unusual aptitude for editorial work, and in 1851 he became one of the editors of the *Congregationalist,* which was then two years old. He was associated in that office with Rev. Edward Beecher, D.D., and Rev. Joseph Haven, Jr. In 1856, Dr. Dexter undertook the general editorship of the paper, and continued in that position till January 1st, 1866, when he withdrew on account of the pressure of parish labors. He also edited the *Congregational Quarterly* from 1859 to 1866, and was one of its founders.

In 1867 Dr. Dexter resigned his pastorate, and became a member of the newly formed firm of W. L. Greene & Co., proprietors of the *Congregationalist,* which in May of that year was consolidated with the *Boston Recorder.* Dr. Dexter took the position of editor-in-chief, which he retained up to the time of his death. Messrs. C. A. Richardson and W. L. Greene continue in the present partnership, though the latter is not actively engaged in work on the paper. Dr. Dexter's death is the first that has ever occurred on the editorial staff.

Always a diligent student, even while carrying the combined responsibilities of the editorial chair and a large city pastorate, Dr. Dexter wrote a number of volumes which attracted wide attention. One of these, Congregationalism : What It Is, Whence It Is, How It Works, has for twenty-five years, in its various editions, been a standard authority as to the usages of the denomination. For longer than that time he has been a prominent figure in the most important church councils held throughout the country. No one is so familiar as he has been with all matters of history related to Congregationalism in this and other countries.

His historical researches have taken him no less than nine times to England and the Continent, where he has had many and long-cherished friendships. He has been a member of the American Antiquarian Society and the Massachusetts Historical Society since 1869, and of the American Historical Association since 1884. From 1877 to 1880 he was the lecturer on Congregationalism at Andover Seminary. In 1865 the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred on him by Iowa College, and the degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology by Yale University in 1880. Last year he received from Yale the degree of Doctor of Laws, being the only one of her sons on whom she has conferred this double honor. Dr. Dexter's part in the recent Andover controversy and in the discussions concerning the administration of the American Board, of which he was a corporate member, are familiar to our readers.

In May, 1889, Rev. A. E. Dunning was admitted to the firm of W. L. Greene & Co., and became associated with Dr. Dexter as editor, with the understanding that he was to succeed Dr. Dexter as editor-in-chief, and that the latter would in the autumn of this year lay aside, in part, the responsibilities of the editorial office in order to complete his Pilgrim history on which he has been engaged for at least thirty years. The condition in which his memoranda for this great work is left is not yet known ; nor is it possible at this time to say whether or not it can be taken up and finished by another hand.

But though he has been relieved of some burdens in this office, he has regularly journeyed to Boston from his pleasant home in New Bedford three days in each week till his final visit on Tuesday of last week. His associates remarked that day on his good health and spirits. On Wednesday he consulted his family physician, who, after thorough examination, pronounced him in good health, and advised him to plan confidently for his contemplated journey abroad a few months hence. He worked in his library that day as usual. and retired apparently as well as ever. The next morning [Nov. 13th], at half-past six he failed to respond to Mrs. Dexter's call, and she found him peacefully lying on his side, his head resting on his hand, apparently asleep ; but life had departed. It is probable that he passed away in his sleep, without a pang.

One of the last things he said, as he left the office for the last time, was concerning one of his plans for the next year : " I shall first ask what the Lord will have me do about it." We little thought that he was even then making ready to enter into the joy of his Lord. But our grief is transfigured by our memories of him ; and we look upward in faith, saying, " He was not ; for God took him."

Dr. Dexter has had four children, of whom three died in childhood. Mrs. Dexter survives him, and his son, Rev. Morton

Dexter, who has for several years been one of the editors of this paper.

FROM REV. DR. R. S. STORRS.

BROOKLYN, November 13, 1890.

MY DEAR SIR: I cannot write anything worthy of him—indeed, I can hardly write at all, under the blinding flash of your telegraphic message announcing the death of Dr. Dexter. No event of a similar kind has struck me with an equal shock since the death of his friend, my dear and lamented brother, Dr. Eustis of Springfield, two and a half years ago. I must wait till thought adjusts itself to so great a change in my familiar outlook upon life before attempting to put reminiscences of him into form, or to present any fairly appreciative estimate of our dear friend and of his work. It seems impossible that his last letter to me, written a few weeks since and now lying before me, is to be his final personal message until I meet him in other realms.

Dr. Dexter was of almost precisely the same age with myself, only three weeks older, if my memory serves me. Our fathers had been friends for many years before we first met, at Andover, in 1843. Dr. Dexter was in the class preceding mine, and graduated a year before me. But we met, of course, in the rhetorical society, in the literary and philosophical student clubs, as well as for frequent animated talk on the sidewalk, or in one another's rooms; and the impression of his noble person, of his earnest, considerate and instructive thought, of his serious and manly purpose to do to the utmost the best work which might open to him for the Lord and His cause—this is as vivid and definite with me as if only yesterday we had met and parted on the Andover hill. The same traits always afterward appeared in his pastorates, at Manchester and in Boston, as they have consistently reappeared in the great editorial work to which so many of his best and most fruitful years have been devoted. What he was in the seminary he has conspicuously continued to be since—faithful, kindly, zealous for the truth as God gave him to see the truth, with no touch of malice or meanness in his spirit, courteous in manner, catholic in temper, of a hospitable mind, while as steadfast against what appeared to him wrong as a rocky cliff against smiting winds.

No one can ever have met him, I am sure, for interchange of thought on important subjects, without feeling the vigor and weight of his mind, the persuasive energy of his convictions, the soundness of his practical judgment, as well as the positiveness of his magnanimous purpose, and the uniform justness and kindness of his feeling. Of course no one ever met him without being freshly impressed by the singular accuracy and range of his knowledge, especially in connection with the earlier and later facts of the New England history. With the blood of the Pilgrims coursing in his veins, he loved reverently to trace their pathway from almost forgotten English hamlets to the historic cities of Holland, over the ocean to this continent, out to their distributed settlements here; and all which followed in the development of their extraordinary history, meager in appearance but mighty in effect, obscure and heroic—with shadows from the past upon it, but infolding germs of magnificent destinies—was as evident to his mind as were the streets which he traversed, or the garden beds in which it was his joy to linger. His early and abiding enthusiasm for what was distinctive and commanding in the builders of New England made him the eager and persistent student that he was of all that concerned them, the eloquent and enlightening writer on all chief aspects of their character and work, at last the decisive authority about them, to those who candidly inquired, or to those who sought occasion for reproach. His latest pamphlet on The English Exiles in Amsterdam only adds another admirable example to the many which had preceded of that patient, faithful, assiduous labor by which he rescued important items of historical knowledge from the darkest and dustiest of overlooked corners.

Of Dr. Dexter as a friend, many will be eager to speak, not a few of whom met him much more frequently than I have done, though hardly any, I think, can have known him longer or more thoroughly. But I gratefully remember that, after forty-seven years of an acquaintance which almost immediately ripened into friendship—a friendship which has never for a moment been interrupted—I have never seen the slightest shade on his spirit of anything which was not loyal and generous, which did not blend fidelity to his convictions with prompt responsiveness to the fine and quick impulse of friendship. He undervalued himself in comparison with his friends. He was to them as a strong tower builded for an armory, with mighty shields hanging in it. His mere presence in any deliberative assembly gave it dignity and distinction. To differ from him, on a question of history or of normal practice, was to covet defeat. Yet his manner was modest, almost deferential. He made suggestions where, with his abounding resources of knowledge and power, he might have commanded instant assent. I never saw him moved by any vehemence of assault, but the wish of a friend had always more weight with him than a preference of his own, and where he had once given his confidence it was like wrenching away a part of his spirit to have to withdraw it. He was so sincerely ardent toward those whom he honored with his affectionate regard that he brought out, by the attraction of his temper, what was best in themselves. He made it easier for them to look at things in a large-minded way, to disregard thoughts of personal convenience, to undertake unwelcome tasks; and every one who intimately knew him felt him to be one on whom all could rely, with unwavering assurance, for helpful counsel, for steadfast support in whatever was right, for frank, fearless and kindly action. I trusted him, for one, as I trust the oaks in front of the door of my summer home. By no means always agreeing with him in particulars of opinion, I was as certain of his moral and intellectual uprightness, and of his unwavering sincerity of friendship, as I am that those oaks will not pull up their roots and go elsewhere, will not refuse in summer their grateful shade to the home which it blesses. The sense of personal loss which comes with your message could hardly have been deeper if he had lived in the next square to me, and we had met a dozen times a month instead of once or twice in a year.

How fast the earthly shadows deepen as those whom we have trusted and honored pass suddenly to the Beyond! How constantly nearer and closer the horizon of time shuts in around those of us who longer wait! But, blessed be God, the immortality comes nearer too, and is clearer to our thought, as through the dim and voiceless dusk with which nature rounds our earthly years we see unclosing, by infinite grace, the gates of light! A noble place, nobly filled, is henceforth vacant upon earth; but another intrepid and manly spirit, faithful to conviction, consecrated to lifelong service for the Master, wide-sighted and gentle, warm in greeting and noble in aspiration, now stands before God! We shall miss him from all the circles here which he so long has instructed and adorned; but his influence will be present, his memory be dear, to all who knew him, till for them, as for him, the bars of darkness break apart, the struggle and the pain are past, and our timid and dull mortality is swallowed up in the exulting and visioned life!

In sorrow, but with joy of memory and of hope, faithfully yours, R. S. STORRS.

To Mr. C. A. Richardson.

IS THERE A ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH?

BY HENRY C. LEA.

From *The Independent*, New York, November 20, 1890.

THE whole structure of the Latin Church and the salvation of its members depend upon the sacraments and their due administration. Without the sacrament of Orders there is no priesthood, and no gift of supernatural powers; without that of baptism there is no membership in the Church Militant, and no salvation; without that of confirmation there is no perfected Christian; without that of penitence, sins, save in rare cases of perfect contrition, are unforgiven; without that of the Eucharist the most efficient means of grace are lost; without that of matrimony marriage is but concubinage. If, therefore, anything in the whole range of Catholic doctrine and practice should be unquestioned and unquestionable, it is the validity of the administration of the sacraments on which the very existence of the Church is founded. Yet it is a curious result of the labors of the schoolmen and theologians, who have built up the vast and intricate structure of modern Catholic belief, that no priest or prelate can be certain that he enjoys the power of the keys, or even that he is capable of holding his position, and no member of the laity can feel assured that any sacrament which he receives is validly administered even if the officiating priest is canonically capable of his functions.

This has arisen from the necessity which the Church has experienced of formulating the doctrine that, in addition to the material and form of the sacrament, the "intention" of the ministrant to perfect it is requisite to its supernatural efficacy. This sprang indirectly from the development of another great question which agitated the Church in its earlier period—the validity of sacraments administered by polluted hands. It was one of the Donatist heresies that baptism was invalid when administered by those who had lapsed, and St. Augustine, in combating the heretics, declared that it made no difference whether the ministrant was good or evil, drunk or sober; it was Christ who baptized, not the priest.* As yet the question of intention had not been broached, but several passages show that he considered the intention of the ministrant to be as unimportant as his character.[*] That this, in fact, was the opinion of the Church of the time, is shown by a story which has greatly exercised modern orthodox theologians. Rufinus, and after him, Sozomen, relates that St. Athanasius, when a boy, with his playfellows, once parodied the services of the Church ; he acted as bishop, and in that capacity performed the rite of baptism on some of his comrades. Alexander, the Bishop of Alexandria, chanced to witness the sport from a window, and thinking that the boys were going too far had them brought before him. On investigating the details of what Athanasius had done, he pronounced the baptisms to be valid, and ordered those who had undergone the rite not to be re-baptized.[†] Whether the story be true or not, it is evident that at the time of the historians there was no question as to the validity of a sacrament administered even in jest, and the labored arguments of post-Tridentine theologians as to details are idle.[‡]

---

* S. August. in Joannem Tract., V, n, 18; de Unitate Ecclesiæ, c. xxlj.

With the disappearance of the Donatists the question as to the validity of the sacraments in polluted hands slumbered for ages. It emerged partially toward the close of the eleventh century, when Gregory VII., in his war against priestly marriage, forbade attendance on the masses of married priests ; but the age was not a critical one, and the Church managed to tide over the inconsistency without much difficulty. It was different when, in the following century, heretics arose, especially the Waldenses, who denied that a wicked priest could perform the awful sacrifice of the altar or could wash away the sins of others with the waters of baptism. The development of sacerdotalism was largely increasing the powers claimed and exercised by the ministers of religion, while the flagitious lives of a majority of them were notorious. The Church could not abandon the position that their sins had no influence on their ministrations. The mysteries of the sacraments were accomplished *ex opere operato*—by the work itself—and not *ex opere operantis*—by the worker.

This degraded the minister into a mere mechanical functionary—a puppet invested with certain attributes and performing certain ceremonies or reciting certain magic formulas which, like the conjurations of the sorcerer, wrought their own results. For a while this did not attract the attention of the schoolmen, who commenced in the twelfth century the labors which were to result in modern Catholic theology and to furnish justification for all the new claims of sacerdotalism. Gratian, who, about 1150, compiled the authoritative body of the canon law, has no allusion to the necessity of the ministrant's volition to the perfection of a sacrament. Peter Lombard, whose "Sentences," written about the same time, remained for centuries the foundation of all theological teaching, is equally silent, save an allusion to the question still disputed, whether a baptism performed in jest is a valid baptism—a question to which he prudently evades an answer.[*] It was impossible, however, that the audacious investigations of the schoolmen, who could leave unsearched no detail in the divine government of Heaven and earth, could pass over such a matter as this, and the question as to the function of the priest, in his constantly extending sphere of ministration, soon began to attract attention. Toward the close of the twelfth century Magister Bandinus alludes incidentally to the intention of the priest as an element in the consecration of the host.[†] Yet this novel suggestion won its way slowly. St. Raymond, of Pennafort, the greatest canonist of his day, in his "*Summa*," written about 1235, makes no allusion to it, though treating of the sacraments in a manner which would have required its introduction had he accepted[‡] it. Soon after this Alexander Hales, followed by St. Bonaventura, virtually argued that intention was not an absolute necessity, for when it is lacking God confers the grace on the recipient without the real sacrament[§]—a position nearly akin to that which was afterward condemned in Luther. The gradual advance of opinion, in this transition period, is seen in the treatment of the question by Henry of Susa, Cardinal of Ostia, who asserts that if the priest intends not to baptize there is no baptism, but that

---

[*] S. August. Epist., xcviij, § 2, ad Bonif.; Contra Cresconium, Lib. III, c. 8.

[†] Rufin. H. e l, xiv.—Sozomen, H. E. II, xvij.

[‡] Busenbaum Medulla Theol., Lib. VI, Tract. j, Cap. 2, Dub. 1.—S. Alphons, Liguori Theol. Moral., Lib. VI, n, 25. Benedicti PP, XIV, De Synodo Diœcesana, Lib. VII, c. iv, n, 5.

---

[*] Solet etiam quæri de illo qui jocans, sicut mimus, commemoratione tamen Trinitatis, immergitur, utrum baptizatus est.—P. Lombardi Sententt, Lib. IV, Dist. vj, n, 5.

The only edition of the "Sentences" to which I have access is that in Migne's *Patrologia*. In it this passage is followed by an impudent forged interpolation in an epistle of St. Augustin respecting the intention of the ministrant. It is probably of comparatively modern date, as it is not referred to by his commentators.

[†] Conficitur autem hoc sacramentum a quolibet sacerdote secundum ritum et intentione conficiendi, utique qui in unitate Ecclesiæ est.—Bandini Sententt, Lib. IV, Dist. xiij.

[‡] Summa S. Raymundi, Lib. III, Tit. xxiv, § 5.

[§] Viva, Damnatorum Thesium Theologica Trutina, Prop. xxviij, Alexandria VIII.

if he has no intention either way, as when drunk, the sacrament is valid.[*]

In this, as in so much else, St. Thomas Aquinas gave the final direction to the doctrines of the Church. Yet Aquinas himself found it by no means easy to grope his way through so doubtful and intricate a subject. In his "Commentary upon the Sentences," he contents himself with stating the conflicting opinions current at the time—some saying that intention was unnecessary, others that if it were lacking Christ supplied the defect—and he ventures to express no decision of his own.[†] In his *Opusculum* on the Sacraments, he asserts positively that without intention there is no sacrament.[‡] Yet in his last and crowning work, unfortunately left unfinished at his death, the secondary questions which speedily suggested themselves made him waver and speak with an inconsistency that has caused him to be cited as authority by theologians of opposite schools. In one passage the priest is relegated to the position of a puppet by the ingenious suggestion of a kind of intention, designated as "habitual" or "virtual," the existence of which is sufficiently proved by his repeating the prescribed formula; this expresses the intention of the Church and suffices for the perfection of the sacraments, unless the contrary is publicly declared at the time. As Aquinas expresses it, he is simply an *instrumentum animatum*, whose only function is to perform mechanically a certain ceremony and to abstain from openly declaring it void. But this he modifies in another passage, in which he says that any perverse intention, such as jocularity or contempt, destroys the validity of the sacrament, especially if manifested externally.[§]

Under the supreme authority of Aquinas, the doctrine of intention, which had been so long struggling for recognition, found a secure lodgment in the theological structure. Durand de Saint-Pourçain, who wrote about a half century later, treats it as an accepted fact that without intention the words of the sacrament are an empty formula.[‖] He illustrates the absolute necessity of specific intention by a celebrated proposition, which has been authenticated by its adoption in the Rubrics of the Roman Missal. If, he says, a priest has eleven wafers before him to consecrate, and thinks that there are only ten, but intends to consecrate them all, they will all be consecrated; if he intends to consecrate only ten, and fixes his mind on one to be excluded while he repeats the formula, then only that one remains unconsecrated; but if he does not exclude one, then none are consecrated, for the intention with regard to each one is imperfect.[*]

Thus far the question had developed itself in the schools and had won its place as an accepted dogma without papal recognition. There were still some doubters, and Pierre de la Palu, one of the most eminent theologians of the early fourteenth century, although a Dominican, adhered to the transition opinions of Alexander Hales and Bonaventura.[†] At last, however, the seal of papal acceptance of the doctrine was given incidentally by Martin V, at the Council of Constance, in 1417, in the instructions to the inquisitors for the suppression of Wickliffitism and Hussitism.[‡] This virtual admission was rendered absolute by Eugenius IV, November 22d, 1439, at the Council of Florence, in the decree of union with the Armenians, where the definition of the sacrament was couched in language borrowed from the *Opusculum* of Aquinas—the absence of intention on the part of the ministrant was declared to render the sacrament imperfect.[§] Thenceforth there could be no question as to the authority of the doctrine as an article of Catholic faith. Savonarola, in his directions to confessors, instructs them to inquire of priestly penitents whether in baptizing they have peformed the rites with the proper intention.[‖]

Occasion soon came to define the doctrine still more formally. Luther's object was to eliminate sacerdotalism, to exalt as much as possible the effects of faith in the believer, and to diminish the functions of the priest as the channel of grace from God to man. It is true that in his first mutterings of revolt, one of the articles nailed to the church door at Wittenberg, in 1517, invoked eternal perdition on those who had faith in the promises of pardon conveyed in indulgences ;[*] but he soon after uttered the celebrated proposition that even if a priest granted absolution in jest, if the penitent believed himself absolved he was absolved, so great was the power of faith and of the words of Christ.[†] This, which was little more than the opinion of Alexander Hales, Bonaventura, and Pierre de la Palu, was included by Leo X among the Lutheran errors denounced in the bull of condemnation in 1520.[‡] When the Council of Trent undertook to define the position of the Church in the face of advancing heresy, it spoke in no uncertain terms on this question, and asserted it to be a point of faith that intention is indispensable in the administration of the sacraments.[§] After such a definition there could no longer be reasonable doubt that it is *de fide* that the intention of the priest forms an integral and indispensable part of a valid sacrament. In a catechism drawn up in 1578, by order of the Bishop of Pavia, for the examination of candidates for ordination, the question as to the constituent parts of a sacrament is answered, "the matter, the form, and the intention of the minister."[‖]

---

[*] Consideratur etiam intentio baptizantis, qui si intendat non baptizare nihil agitur, quidquid Gra. et alii dicant, sed si intendat baptizare vel non habeat intentionem baptizato contrarium, valet, unde ebrius baptizat.—Hostiensis Aurea Summa, Lib. III, De Baptismo, n. 8.

[†] Aquinas super Libb. Sententt., Lib. IV., Dist. vj, Art. 2.

[‡] Si aliquid deest, id est si non sit debita forma verborum, et si non sit debita materia, et si minister sacramenti non intendit sacramentum conficere non perficitur sacramentum.—Opusc. V. de Art. Fidei et Ecclesiæ Sacramentis.

[§] Summa, P. III, Q. lxiv, Art. 8, 10: "Intentio ministri perversa et mala respectu sacramenti tollit veritatem sacramenti . . . puta cum aliquis non, intendit sacramentum conferre, sed derisorie aliquid agere: et talis perversitas tollit veritatem sacramenti, præcipue quando suam intentionem exterius manifestat."

[‖] Durandi de S. Portiano Comment. super Sententias, Lib. IV, Dist. vj, Q. 2, §§ 8–10.

[*] Ibid., Dist. xj, Q. 7: "Probatio, quia illa intentio non sufficit ad consecrationem alicujus hostiæ sub qua æqualiter quælibet hostia includitur et excluditur."

[†] Viva Theologica Trutina, *ubi sup.*—Pallavicini Historia Conc. Trident IX, vj, 2.

[‡] Item, utrum credat quid malus sacerdos cum debita materia et forma et cum intentione faciendi quod facit ecclesia, vere conficiat, vere absolvat, vere baptizet et vere conferat alia sacramenta.—Concil. Constant, Sess. ult. (Harduin, Collect. Concil., VIII. 915).

[§] Hæc omnia sacramenta tribus perficiuntur, videlicet rebus tanquam materia, verbis tanquam forma, et persona ministri conferentis sacramentum cum intentione faciendi quod facit ecclesia: quorum si aliquod desit non perficitur sacramentum.—Concil. Florent. (Harduin, IX. 438).

[‖] Savonarolæ Confessionale, Ed. 1578, fol. 32b.

It is true that a doctrine of origin so recent and fraught with consequences so tremendous could not be injected into the faith without some protests and some efforts to mitigate its dangers. As the validity of all the ministrations of the Church, involving the future life of all its members, depended on the secret mental processes of the ministrant, casuists busied themselves with defining the undefinable and infinite varieties of intention which a priest might have in performing his functions. The simplest classification is into four species—actual, virtual, habitual and interpretative. Actual intention is held to be desirable, but not essential ; it exists when the priest has his attention fixed on his acts and wishes to perform them. Virtual intention is when he does what he otherwise would not do in virtue of an intention previously held and not revoked, as when he puts on the vestments to celebrate mass and performs the ceremony without further thought. Habitual intention is volition previously entertained and not revoked, but so interrupted that it cannot be regarded as efficacious. Interpretative intention is what one has not but would have if he happened to think about the matter. Then there are explicit and implicit attention, direct and indirect, absolute and conditioned. In practice the line is drawn between virtual and habitual intention ; the former suffices for the validity of sacraments, the latter does not. Neither will indirect intention ; if a priest intends to administer a sacrament and gets drunk he cannot be considered to have more than habitual intention, which is insufficient, though we have seen that St. Augustine considered him capable, and that this opinion was entertained as lately as the time of Cardinal Henry of Ostia. Nor does it suffice that the priest has a mere material intention of employing the matter and form materially ; there must be a formal intention of using them sacramentally and of doing what the Church does ; the Church does not perform a profane and material ceremony, but a holy and supernatural one, which requires the participation of the volition of the performer.[*]

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

---

[*] M. Lutheri Theses, Art. 32.

[†] M. Lutheri Concio de Pœnitentia (Opp. Jenæ, 1564, T. I, fol. 15a).

[‡] Leon. PP, X, bull. *Exsurge Domine*, Prop. 12 (Mag. Bullar. Roman, Ed. Luxeomb, I, 611).

[§] Si qui dixcerit : in ministris dum sacramenta conficiunt et conferunt non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi quod facit ecclesia, anathema sit.—C. Trident. Sess. VII, De Sacramentis in genere, c. xj.

[‖] "Ex materia, forma et intentione ministri."—Dr. Alex. Sanlii Addit. ad Savonarolæ Confessionale. fol. 66b. (Cf. Fr. Toleti Summa Casuum Conscientiæ, Lib. II, c, xvj. Caramuelis Theol. Fundamentalis, n, 1915. Estius in Lib. IV, Sententt, Dist. I, § 23. Reiffenstuel, Theol. Moralis Tract, XIV, Dist. i, n, 36.)

[*] Ferraris, Prompta Biblioth. s. v. *Intentio*, 1-23.—(Cf. Busenbaum Medulla Theol., Lib. VI. Tract i. cap. 2, Dub. 1. Liguori Theol. Moral., Lib. VI, n, 16, 17, 18, 25.)

THE UPLIFTED GAZE.

BY REV. A. J. GORDON, D.D.

From *The Messiah's Herald* (Adventist), Boston, October 22, 1890.

HAVE we thought how significant and full of instruction is the earliest attitude of the Church as presented in the opening chapter of the Acts : "Ye men of Galilee, *why stand ye gazing up into heaven?*" In a single graphic sentence is thus indicated the primitive uplook of Christianity ; and this question, with what immediately follows, is uttered, not so much for rebuke as for interpretation. The Great High Priest has just passed within the veil, and the cloud-curtain has shut him out of sight. And, as the Hebrew congregation, upon the great day of atonement, looked steadfastly upon the receding form of Aaron as he disappeared within the veil, and continued looking long after he was out of sight, waiting for his reappearance; so exactly did these men of Galilee, though they knew not what they did. And the angels were sent to declare to them the meaning of their action: "This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." This is the earliest post-ascension announcement of that gospel of hope which, at the first, began to be spoken by the Lord himself,—"If I go . . . I will come again,"—which is now confirmed unto us by his angels, and is henceforth to be reiterated by apostle and seer till, from the last page of Revelation, it shall be heard sounding forth its "Surely I come quickly."

The second coming of Christ is the crowning event of redemption; and the belief of it constitutes the crowning article of an evangelical creed. For we hold that the excellence of faith is according to the proportion of the Lord's redemptive work which that faith embraces. Some accept merely the earthly life of Christ, knowing him only after the flesh; and the religion of such is rarely more than a cold, external morality. Others receive his vicarious death and resurrection, but seem not to have strength as yet to follow him into the heavens; such may be able to rejoice in their justification without knowing much of walking in the glorified life of Christ. Blessed are they who, believing all that has gone before,—life, death, and resurrection,—can joyfully add this confession also: "We have a great High Priest who is passed through the heavens;" and thrice blessed they who can join to this confession still another: "From whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ." For it is the essential part of our Redeemer's priesthood that, having entered in, to make intercession for his people, he shall again come forth to bless them. How sweet was the sound of the golden bells upon the high priest's garments, issuing from the holy of holies, and telling the waiting congregation of Israel that, though invisible, he was still alive, bearing their names upon his breast-plate, and offering up prayers for them before God! But, though they listened intently to these reassuring sounds from within the veil, they watched with steadfast gaze for his reappearing, and for the benediction of his uplifted hands that should tell of their acceptance. This they counted the crowning act of his ministration. Therefore, says the Son of Sirach, "How glorious was he before the multitude of his people, in his coming forth from within the veil! He was as the morning star in the midst of the cloud, or as the moon when her days are full." If this could be said of the typical high priest, how much more of the true! Glorious beyond description will be his reemergence from the veil; "the bright and morning star," breaking forth from behind the cloud that received him out of sight; his once pierced hands lifted in benediction above his church, while that shall be fulfilled which is written in the Hebrews: "And when he again bringeth in the firstborn into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him" (Heb. 1 : 6, R. V.).

The attitude of the men of Galilee became the permanent attitude of the primitive church; so that the apostle's description of the Thessalonian Christians—"Ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven"—might apply equally to all. Talk we of "the notes of a true church"? Here is one of the most unquestionable,—the uplifted gaze. As apostate Christianity, by a perverse instinct, is perpetually aping the eastward posture of Paganism (Ezek. 8 : 16), so inevitably is apostolic Christianity constantly recurring to the upward posture of Primitivism. What Tholuck says of Israel, that, "As no other nation of antiquity, it is a people of expectation," is equally true of the church of the New Testament. It is anchored upward, not downward; its drawing is forward, not backward; "Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil, whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus." As the ancient *Anchorius* bore the anchor into port, and fastened it there, while as yet the ship could not enter, because of the tide; so has our *Prodromos*—our Precursor—fixed the church's hold within the veil, that it may not drift away through adverse winds or tides. But this anchoring is only a preparation for that entering which he shall effect for us when he shall come again to receive us unto himself.

What if those who are much occupied with looking up, zealous to "come behind in no gift, waiting for the coming of the Lord," should sometimes be stigmatized as star-gazers and impracticable dreamers? Let them rejoice that, in so acting, they prove themselves, not only the sons of primitive Christianity, but also the sons of primitive humanity. For, in the beginning, God made man upright, both physically and morally. Some tell us that the derivation of *anthropos*—man—makes the word signify an onlooker. Certainly, this originally constituted his marked distinction from the brutes that perish, that, while they looked downward toward the earth, which is their goal, he looked upward toward the heaven for which he was predestined. How significant the question which Jehovah puts to the first sinner of Adam's sons : "Why is thy countenance fallen ?" The wages of sin is death, and the goal of the sinner is the earth with its narrow house. So we find the whole apostate race, from the earliest transgressor onward, with countenance downcast and shadowed with mortality, moving toward the tomb and unable to lift up the eyes. But the sons of the second Adam appear looking up to heaven and saying : "We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor." His coronation has restored their aspiration : it has lifted their gaze upward once more to the throne.

The tabernacle imagery is still further suggestive touching the subject under consideration. Ask the ritualist, clothed in his rich vestments, and offering his eucharist sacrifice upon the altar, why he does thus ; and the answer is, that the minister must repeat in the church on earth what our Great High Priest is doing in the true tabernacle above. But if this principle were faithfully carried out, it would prove the death-warrant of ritualism. The great day of atonement is now passing ; let all sacrifices and services cease without the veil. Oh, ye self-ordained priests, why do ye "stand daily ministering and offering, oftentimes, the same sacrifices which can never take away sins ?" Behold, "this Man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his foes be made his footstool." They most literally reflect his ministry on earth who, at the communion, sit down to remember the sacrifice of Calvary, but not to repeat it ; who listen to the "Till he come," which it whispers, and so unite with him in his "expecting." He waits for the same event for which he bids us wait, his triumphal return. And for the congregation before the veil, not worship, but work and witnessing, are now the principal calling,—work and witnesing with special reference to that glorious consummation which our Saviour is anticipating. For, as he assigns us our service, this is the language of his commission : "Occupy till I come ;" and, as he appoints us our testimony, this is the purport of it : "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness to all nations ; and then shall the end come."

A STRANGE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL.

BY J. T. TUCKER, D.D.

From *The Church Union*, New York, October 15, 1890.

In these days of creed-revisions and substitutions, the numerous persons who have not read the memoirs of Frederick Denison Maurice may be interested in the account there given by his son—and partly also by himself—of the early religious home-life of this eminent theologian, the singular doctrinal entanglements of which had much to do in shaping his own beliefs in after years.

Maurice was the son and grandson of dissenting clergymen. The grandfather belonged to the sect of English Presbyterians —an orthodox body standing midway between the followers of John Knox in Scotland and the Episcopalian establishment of the realm ; being less inclined to subscribe to the Calvinism of the Westminster Confession than to agree with the prescriptions of the Episcopal body. They had come together as an organized communion out of the contentions and confusions of the Tudor and Stuart times, crystallizing around a common sentiment—"an utter aversion to all formal expressions of creed. Creeds had become detestable, partly because of the wrangling which had been connected with them during the time of [the earlier] Presbyterian ascendancy in England, and more recently because persecutions had been due to the enforcement of religious formulæ." This English type of Presbytery was ground out between the upper and nether millstones of the Scottish Kirk and the parliamentary Bishops. In faith and sentiment it was evangelical. In the grandfather's days the Maurice "family appears to have been strictly and even zealously orthodox." His son Michael, the father of Frederick, was sent for education to one of the chief schools for the children of the Presbyterians. One of their most trusted friends was Richard Baxter, whom the church by law established vainly tempted with one of its bishoprics. The Bible was a text-book of supreme authority among these quiet, unpolemical people, at home, at school, and at church.

But a movement was already on foot out of which English Unitarianism was soon to develop an organized form, intensely aggressive at first under the impulse given it by its two founders, Priestly and Belsham, but not destined to a large numerical growth. This soon swept in the father of our sketch, with his congregation; and, in a few years, a family of five daughters and the wife and mother were found agreeing substantially with their head in these views. Michael Maurice, as his father, was a man of decided traits of character intellectually and morally. He was positive in his convictions, liberal in holding them, fond of disputation, yet not attempting to sway the beliefs of his family or of his pupils to his own conclusions. The large family growing to maturity around him was decidedly of the strong-minded stamp; and its precocious juniors were soon adding their strenuous qualities to the parental stock. Three of the five girls were older than their afterward famous brother. The two elder of them soon outrun their father in the new departure—"growing up into Unitarians of a very different type from that of their father in every respect except his intense political liberalism. . . . The girls seem from their earliest years to have had an interest in the discussion of abstract theological dogma which it is hard to realize. They by no means entertained their father's scruples as to pressing their creed upon his pupils." A governess, not older than the eldest of the sisters, having been engaged to take charge of them, was soon unsettled in her orthodox faith by their reasonings, and brought over to their opinions.

Here was indeed a remarkable domestic atmosphere—"an argumentative, disputative form of opinions," drawing into its seething circle other connections by kinship and marriage, into the midst of which the boy Frederick was to find himself launched as his mind opened to serious thought; one would think not a hopeful environment for a future doctor of divinity, in a very creative interpretation of that title. But in some autobiographic notes made many years thereafter, he wrote: "I now deliberately regard it as one of the greatest mercies of my life that I had this birth and the education which belonged to it." That he was influenced in some directions by the Unitarian surroundings of his boyhood he distinctly recognized; that these influences did not carry him into that belief is equally certain. "My father's Unitarianism was not of a fiercely dogmatic kind. But it made him intolerant of what he considered intolerance in Churchmen or Dissenters; pleased when either would work with him, sensitive to slights from them. My mother had a clearer intellect than my father, a much more lively imagination, a capacity for interests in a number of subjects, and an intense individual sympathy. . . . My mind had thus received an early theological complexion, and my father greatly desired that I should be a minister among the Unitarians like himself. I took it for granted that I was to be so; he was not, of course, unwise enough to put a child upon a study of controversies. I was only recommended to read the Bible regularly, and many discussions about it went on in my presence. . . . There was something of formality about the old Unitarian conceptions of the Bible. My father believed in it more strongly and passionately than most of his sect, and was an enthusiastic champion of the Bible Society."

But now another change was coming over this unanchored domestic group which was to revolutionize its future more radically than before. In the six years of Frederick Maurice's life, between the age of ten and sixteen, the whole family (except the father) of five daughters and the mother, with several relatives in close intimacy with this home circle, passed over from an intolerant style of liberal principles to the extreme contrary of a literal construction of Westminster Calvinism. The governess, also, who had exchanged her orthodoxy for Unitarianism under the proselyting urgency of her pupils, now found the way open for a return to her former faith. This change of doctrinal base began in the conversion of a favorite cousin of the Maurice children, who had been "particularly strong in Unitarian opinions, pursuing them [says Mr. M.] more logically and consistently than my father, and had arrived at bolder conclusions." An intimacy with a very superior woman, born a Quaker, but afterward a Moravian, a Mrs. Schimmelpennick—had much to do with this change, arousing the younger woman "to feel the need of a personal deliverer such as her old system did not tell her of." Fatal sickness now came into the circle and deepened its serious mood. One of the sisters visited the newly converted cousin, and returned "utterly dissatisfied with my father's opinions. My third sister, a very earnest, solitary thinker, who had long been studying such books as Law's Serious Call, sympathized with her, though their habits of mind were very unlike." The second sister, who was with the dying cousin, "arrived more slowly at the same impatience of Unitarianism." John Wesley's teachings were an early influence in the same direction. "Gradually they all, for a while, became strong Calvinists; the form of belief which was most offensive to the Unitarians and to my father."

These novitiates took the Geneva symbols in their severest sense of a positive, personal, inclusive and exclusive election to salvation; assuming that every one can determine for himself whether or no he belongs to this select body by the possession of "a saving faith." Vol. 1, p. 29. They carried their convictions to the point of repudiating their childhood baptism, undergoing immersion, and joining a society of Baptists. Within two years, two of the sisters, still living at home with their father, informed him by letter: "We do not think it consistént with the duty we owe to God to attend a Unitarian place of worship;" and that they cannot longer consent to take the communion with him. A few years later Mrs. Maurice followed their example, being, in her own words, sufficiently convinced that she had before made to herself a most false god, and that she had never worshipped the God revealed in the Scriptures. The father and husband, thus forsaken by his kindred, and suffering deeply from this alienation of religious sympathy, seems to have accepted the situation with Christian patience and meekness. His son, Frederick, was growing to share his father's way of thinking on a variety of absorbing social and national questions, and to be in some degree a companion of the old man's leisure hours. The house was still full of discussions which went on in his presence about the Bible, largely turning upon the Divinity of Christ. What the general effect of all this upheaval and reconstruction of doctrinal opinion was on this young and reflective observer, and especially as bearing upon his own subsequent agency—lifelong and earnest—in shaping theological thought, is a question most naturally arising in the reader's mind. His own testimony is explicit. It occurs in one of his letters: "I not only believe in the Trinity in Unity, but I find in it the centre of all my beliefs; the rest of my spirit, when I contemplate myself or mankind. But strange as it may seem, I owe the depth of this belief in a great measure to my training in my home. The very name that was used to describe the denial of this doctrine is the one which most expresses to me the end that I have been compelled, even in spite of myself, to seek. . . . The desire for *Unity* has haunted me all my life through; I have never been able to substitute any desire for that, or to accept any of the different schemes for satisfying it which men have devised."

Like every adventurer upon the delicate task of readjusting Christian dogma to the expanding thought of the times, this man of masterly intellect and most sympathetic heart was only passing out from the distressful controversies of his father's roof to sharper contentions on the world's wider stage, which followed him to the close of life. Yet there can be no doubt that the main purpose of his busy and sometimes aggressive work, as a leader of religious criticism and inquiry, has been truly expressed in the last citation. It was and ever must be a noble ambition to harmonize and unify the spiritual beliefs, affections, activities, of the body of Christ among men, even though the reign of the promised peace and the kingdom of heaven upon earth is still "a hope deferred"—God only knows how long.

THE DEATH OF A MASTER OF STYLE.

From *The Christian Advocate* (Methodist), New York, October 23, 1890.

Professor Austin Phelps, of Andover Theological Seminary, who died at his summer residence at Bar Harbor, Me. [Oct. 13, 1890], was one of the most widely known and yet least known writers of distinction and professors of renown in this country. Few scholars, writers, and theological teachers have interested us more, and to the peculiarities of none have we given closer study. Dr. Phelps was a prolific author. This is but a partial list of his works: *The Still Hour, The New Birth, The Theory of Preaching*, and *English Style in Public Discourse.* In the writer's early ministry two of them were his constant companions. One to this day is a pleasant antidote to the roughnesses and excitements of busy life.

As a teacher, he was greatly admired. He was but twenty-eight years of age when he became a professor at Andover, succeeding Professor Park in the Chair of Homiletics, who was then transferred to that of Theology. Professor Park, intense, fervid, rhetorical, logical, is still active, though in very infirm health. Pre-eminently was Professor Phelps a rhetorician in the highest sense of a much-abused word. True, his style was very elaborate, a charge that can be laid to the door of most preachers who use the pen exclusively, but what excellence did it not contain? We think that no writer of the age possessed greater versatility. Words with him were what shades of color are to the painter, tones to the orator or singer, gestures to the pantomimist. Sometimes he is as terse as Lacon, again as affluent in metaphor as the poems of Ossian, occasionally brilliant as the most sparkling novelist. Most noticeable was the skill, reaching genius, with which in his most carefully prepared passages he threw an air of naturalness and spontaneity over the whole. Such a man did not need to go begging publishers; they sought him. His writings were always in demand, and publishers say he was as keen in selling them as the most successful salesman of ordinary commercial wares. Why should he not have been? It requires genius to compete with publishers. "It is naught, it is naught, saith the buyer: but when he goeth his way, then he boasteth." Professor Phelps knew that his work was not naught, and when he went his way after selling, while he boasted not, he had reason to be content. If sometimes he was too keen it was from an overweening sense of the rights of an author even after the copyright had been sold.

His mind had a hereditary tendency to credulity: he would believe any statement of phenomena which could be accounted the work of spirits, but did not accept the theory that they were the work of departed spirits, but of devils. Our readers may remember a series of editorials reviewing and pointing out the fallacy and unwisdom of his directions to ministers with regard to such phenomena which appeared in this paper about five years ago.

Professor Phelps as a preacher, judging from the only occasion when we heard him, was disappointing. He read closely, but his articulation was distinct, his appearance and manner dignified and very attractive; though unimpassioned as respects emotion, he had an intense intellectual earnestness. Few preachers held audiences as he could. His apparent calmness equalled that of Wendell Phillips. The stimulus which he unquestionably produced resulted in large measure from the clearness of his thought and the beauty and accuracy of his expression. Professor Phelps greatly admired four men—Dr. Mason, Dr. Griffin, Dr. Taylor, and Albert Barnes; perhaps the last came nearer his ideal.

His influence upon students—if we may judge by the representations made to us by a number of those who received his instructions—was both helpful and harmful. He illustrated his own theories of the art of preaching so perfectly, and vindicated them in his oral discourses to students so charmingly and persuasively, that most, regardless of their natural gifts and tendencies, imitated him. He made them forget that "the sermon is the man preaching," and that only Austin Phelps could preach as he did. All students are liable to forget that imitation is neither creative nor effective because not natural. Some of Dr. Phelps's students took on his nature, but never made it second nature, and halt feebly all their days. The brighter and deeper of them made excellent use of such of his qualities as they could assimilate, developing in after years the nature which under his potent spell had been checked and suppressed.

Seven years ago, when the writer delivered a series of lectures at Andover Theological Seminary, he had an excellent opportunity of learning much of Dr. Phelps. Theologically he inclined to the New Haven school as represented by his friend, Dr. Taylor, whom he was asked to succeed in the New Haven Seminary as Professor of Theology, but he preferred to remain at Andover as Professor of Rhetoric and Homiletics. The stamp of Jonathan Edwards was upon him. We suppose that those of our readers who have read or may read *The New Birth* will derive the best illustrations of our ideas of his theological tone, his conception of doctrinal preaching, and also find a magnificent exhibition of his pellucid style.

In conversation, unconsciously to himself and to them, he educated all with whom he mingled. Under all circumstances he was a Christian gentleman. The late Dr. Joseph P. Thompson, who knew what it was to be a gentleman, thought him the best of the old with the most seductive elements of the new school. Dr. Phelps never left a sentence unfinished, shortened a word, or resorted to any vulgarism in speech. His language and apparel agreed in bespeaking the cultivated gentleman. He had large self-complacency and equal self-esteem; yet they reached such height of perfection, and were so self-modifying and balancing, and so blended with taste and culture and mellowed with reverent piety, that it was only as one remembered, after departing from his presence, how potent a centre of his thoughts and feelings himself and his family had been, that he became aware of the existence of "the noblest infirmity of great minds," of which ambition is but a fruit rather than, as it is commonly supposed, a root.

Why should he not have been complacent? Dean Swift said the kinds of pride are three: pride of riches, pride of birth, and pride of genius. Professor Phelps came of a gifted family, and his children on both sides have a distinguished ancestry. Elizabeth Stuart Phelps is certainly a genius. Professor Stuart Phelps, long a Teacher of Philosophy at Smith College, was a brilliant and a subtle mind, and the whole family unite the power of expression, moral sympathy, an imaginative temperament, and the high, intellectual ambition of the best New England stock.

The reader need not suppose that we claim to have been of Professor Phelps's friends, but simply are of his admirers, and a student of the qualities which we predicate of him. He had few if any intimate friends; essentially a lonely man, making himself delightful, but dwelling within a penumbra, to the periphery of which he came when called, and into the darkness of which he retreated. Only Nathaniel Hawthorne could really describe him. We spoke of being disappointed in the first impression of a public effort, but the reverence and beauty of his prayer suggested as a suitable setting a cathedral on the shore of a silent river, with the twilight and the bowed heads of the worshipping congregation, and the soft breathings of adoration.

Professor Phelps was not influential in the management of affairs. So far as we can ascertain he has shaped no policy nor materially affected the life of his own Denomination. He was not naturally a controvertist, and could never have raised the trumpet of reform, though a supporter of all good things. In the study with pen in hand he was a reformer, and would occasionally apparently unconsciously to himself glide into controversy, but just at the time that men of another mould would have been gathering their forces for a mightier blow he shrunk back into his musings and routine life.

For more than thirty years he was an invalid, suffering untold horrors from inflammatory rheumatism. To live at all without excruciating agony he was frequently under the power of strong medicines, therefore he was greater and less great than he would have been without these agonies.

Exclusive of the peculiar part which John Henry Newman took in controversy we know no name in this country suggesting so many points of intellect and sensibility in the author of "Lead, kindly Light," as that of Professor Austin Phelps.

A NEW BIBLE NEEDED.

From *The Christian Intelligencer* (Reformed Dutch), New York, November 5, 1890.

[A very clever book on eschatology has recently been issued in England. The author, in treating of Restorationism, makes the point that if this view be correct the world will need a new reading of the Bible, and he carries it out with such force and spirit that we copy the passage.]

If the Restoration theory be true—if all men and devils are to be restored—we shall want a new Bible to tell us so; or, if we are not to do violence to our understandings, and all the rules of language, new light from heaven to enable us to read the old Bible in accordance with this theory. We should read something like the following: The chaff, by being burned up with unquenchable fire, is converted into good grain. The corrupt tree, bearing evil fruit, by being cast into the fire and burned becomes a good fruit-bearing tree. The fruitless vine branches, when burned in the fire, bear much fruit. The tares are changed in the furnace of fire into wheat. The bad fish, by being thrown away, become wholesome and good. The house built upon the sand, by being washed away, is raised again from its ruins and stands firm and fast forever. He who, in a cowardly manner, saves his life in this world, and loses it in the next, shall find it again all the same. Those who deny Christ here, and are by Him denied at the judgment, yet will He confess and bless. The many who enter the wide gate and broad way of destruction will find them, ultimately, to be the way of salvation. The blasphemers of the Holy Spirit will all be forgiven in the world to come—Christ's solemn negation notwithstanding. The wicked vine-dressers, who are miserably destroyed, shall have their vineyard restored to them again. The King, in destroying those who murdered the messengers sent to invite to the marriage of his son, and burning up their city, made them worthy to sit down at the marriage dinner. The sons of Gehenna, of perdition, of wrath, and of the devil, become the sons of God and heirs of glory. The wicked servant that was cut in sunder is healed and rewarded like the faithful. The door that was shut on the foolish virgins will be opened again, and they will be admitted to the second sitting down. The unprofitable servant who was deprived of his talent and cast into outer darkness will yet hear the King say: "Thou wicked and slothful servant, well done, for after all thou art good and faithful; enter into the joy of thy Lord." The outer darkness and blackness of darkness will be illumined by Divine light, and the weeping and gnashing of teeth give place to the love and joy of heaven. Those who are thrust out of the kingdom shall yet be admitted, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God. The impassable gulf between hell and heaven is bridged, and Lazarus and Dives have free ingress and egress. The men who said, "We will not have this man to rule over us," by being slain as enemies, are made loyal subjects. Those ground to powder by the rock falling on them are restored and built on the rock which crushed them. It is said, "He that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth in him;" but this is all nonsense. He *shall see* life, and the wrath of God shall *not* abide on him. The Judge dismisses the goats into the eternal fire, which is only a wholesome fire that will turn them into good sheep, and bless them and make them a blessing. It will purge away all their guilt—converting their disbelief into faith, their enmity into love, their sinfulness into righteousness. The pains of hell shall blossom into Divine joy, and they shall come out like gold tried and purified in the fire. The fire itself is not eternal. Most assuredly their undying worm will die and their quenchless fire be quenched. All the strong language used about future punishment is just make-believe to frighten timid souls.

It is marvellous that Christ, the Incarnate Love and Incarnate Truth, should deny the wicked, be ashamed of them, disown them, and bid them depart into everlasting punishment as "workers of iniquity," *well knowing* all the time that in a shorter or longer period they would return to His arms and heart as friends, and be made happy forever in the enjoyment of His favor; and yet send out no ray of light to gild the terrible gloom, give no hint of this great change, no word of cheer to ease their pains and inspire them with hope! Oh, it is hard, it is cruel, it is incredible! And this is all the more surprising, seeing that the Scriptures are so full of consolation and encouragement for the children of God, who suffer in the present life, by holding out the prospect of deliverance and resultant glorious reward hereafter; while to those of His creatures who have to endure the far greater sufferings of hell, the all-merciful Father has no word of encouragement respecting relief, or end, or outcome, but is absolutely dumb.

On the restoration theory we might have expected Paul to say: "The wrath and indignation, the tribulation and anguish to every soul of man that doeth evil, will work out for them more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory!" Death, the wages of sin, develops into eternal life! The wood, hay and stubble built on the foundation laid, when tried by the fire, are changed into gold, silver, and precious stones! The acceptable time is not the Now; for it extends into the world to come! Men may sow tares and reap wheat! May sow to the flesh, reap eternal life, all the same as if they had sown to the Spirit! Sinners have no inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God; yet when the wrath of God comes upon them, it gives them at length a title and fitness for it. When Christ comes with the angels of His power and flaming fire rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus, they shall *not* suffer punishment, even eternal destruction, from the face of the Lord, and from the glory of His might, but shall by and by be glorified with Him and all His saints! Peter and Jude speak of wicked angels and men kept under punishment unto judgment, and also of the perdition and corruption of the ungodly; but have omitted to add that these are but the necessary, though painful, processes of final restoration! John, too, should have written: The smoke of their torment goeth *not* up forever and ever; for the tree of life, whose leaves are for the healing of the nations, stands on the banks of the lake of fire and brimstone; and this lake itself becomes the river of the water of life to all mankind!

If the Restoration theory be true, surely we have a right to expect that the Scriptures would have spoken of it clearly and distinctly; but no writings could more effectually have concealed the truth than they have done in this case. Poor children of earth! the Holy Spirit, given to guide you into all truth, has only misled you on this most vital truth!

A GERMAN VIEW OF TEMPERANCE.

From *The Examiner* (Baptist), New York, November 6, 1890.

It aids us to study home questions to have light from outside. "A foreign nation is a contemporaneous posterity." In this view the judgment of Professor Paulsen, of Berlin University, may be instructive. This distinguished teacher put forth a work last year, *System der Ethik*, which discusses the German temperance question with ability and candor. The author is not an ascetic; he would not be called an evangelical Christian here; he dislikes parson rule, and he does not dream of total abstinence or of prohibition. How will such a man, honest and well-informed, treat this subject? Some tourists come back from a thirty days' trip to Europe to tell zealous workers that if we used beer and wine as they do abroad we should have no temperance problem. We are told by some of our German neighbors that all restrictive measures are needless and oppressive. We are charged with a hateful "Puritanism" when we urge legal measures to limit the plague. Let their own national teacher of morals correct these one-sided notions. "No one is ignorant of the extent to which the life of modern civilized peoples is laid waste by excess in drink. The German people especially seem to have been addicted to this vice even from ancient times. There are parts of Germany where a considerable part of the men are ruined by liquor, and no land is exempt from the disturbances and ravages of this evil. Social life is brought to confusion, family life is embittered, spiritual life is made coarse and desolate, and physical life at last decays, directly in consequence of drunkenness. Pauperism, crime, a throng of diseases, insanity, suicide, degeneration of the common stock, are the sad results. That here lies an exceedingly grievous danger for the entire further life development of civilized peoples is a conviction which is daily more diffused among earnest men of insight."

METHODS OF COMBATING IT.

He then discusses methods of meeting this evil. "The German government, in 1881, laid before the Reichstag a law which proposed fine and imprisonment for drunkenness accompanied by disturbance of the peace, and confinement in a hospital of habitual drunkards. In the discussion of this bill the objection was raised that it would restrict personal liberty. This argument seems to me utterly untenable. Drunkenness makes one incapable of rational reflection and purpose, but not of action. Moreover, drink predisposes to irrational action and to injury of other persons. The casual connection between drunkenness and crime, and particularly crimes against the person, is well enough known. The statisticians assert that about three-fourths of all crimes are committed under the influence of alcohol. The wilful act of making one's self drunk is an attack on the security of others. It is a punishable offence now to permit a biting dog to run at large, or to leave snow before one's door; and so drunkenness should be regarded as worthy of punishment, even if, by mere accident, no one is injured. The very fact of intoxication is a menace and a terror.

"To detain a habitual drunkard in a hospital for treatment seems no violation of personal rights. We think it within the province of society to confine the insane man, even against his will, in order that he may not do injury to himself or to others; so it is proper to take the man who is robbed of reason by alcohol to a place of protection and cure, in order to guard himself and his neighbors from the consequences of his disorder. Of course special care should be taken against arbitrary and unjust administration of such a law."

He thinks, however, that in the present state of public opinion in Germany even such a law could not be enforced. Not only the lower classes but even so-called "good society" take the matter too lightly. Among many circles of students and professors in the schools, and among the educated classes beastly intoxication is too generally treated in a flippant and jocular fashion. "So long as 'good society' on this point is so indulgent with itself it has reason to doubt its call to educate baser society to temperance by the punishment of drunkenness. The law cannot create morality, it can only guard that which already exists."

CHANGE IN SOCIAL SENTIMENTS.

The author draws some hope from history. "At the beginning of the modern age the fashion of becoming intoxicated was universal in courts of princes and among the nobility. In these regions this custom was gradually repressed during the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries through the courtly culture brought hither from France. Since the middle of the eighteenth century this vice has gradually diminished in educated circles in consequence of the pressure of higher spiritual interests and finer morality. Although it continues with obstinacy among certain circles of youthful students, and extends even into their later years, still we can say that it no longer belongs to 'good form.' Among officials and respectable citizens intoxication, although judged mildly enough in individual instances, is not a recognized custom. Its special stronghold at present is with the lower and lowest grades of society, among whom it seems to have been introduced slowly since the seventeenth century. The increase of the consumption of brandy during the nineteenth century has been terrible, and it is the measure of the plague, since brandy is the liquor of the masses." He urges the higher classes to set the example of temperance. "That which is not respectable stands on dying roots; it is first regarded as vulgar and then thrust out. The use of fiery drinks is repulsive; there is poetry in wine and even in beer, but none in brandy."

There is a wide field for social effort in voluntary societies for those who will mind the old maxim to "first sweep before one's own door." "The joy in beer of academic and non-academic Philistinism which is so general in Germany, and the worship of appetite among the rich and aristocratic world are not inferior aggravations of this plague. Can any one who, day after day, morning and evening, sits by the hour in the clouds of tobacco smoke in a beer house indulging in stupid, hundred-times repeated gossip and wasteful play, only to carry home at last an empty, heavy head, can such a person bring serious zeal to important achievements? Can he who fills life with dining set his soul to such enterprises?"

The author commends coffee houses as substitutes for saloons; points to the Swedish system of limiting the number of places of sale, and of stern restrictions as to hours and persons. Returning to the principle of these laws, he declares a truth which would justify prohibition itself: "As legislation has limited the liberty of the individual to ruin himself by closing gambling houses, and has surrounded the sale of poisons with careful regulations, so it is right to hedge with restrictive regulations the sale of that poison to which more victims fall than to all others, a thousand times more." He would make the dram-seller liable for encouraging drunkards to drink, and would refuse the machinery of the law to collect debts made for alcoholic liquors. He would make brandy costly by heavy taxes, thinking that if the glass is smaller the number of drinkers would not be increased.

The discussion awakens more than a suspicion that the lighter liquors, far from promoting temperance, tend to create a diseased craving for stronger stimulants. Beer in this country is certainly the ordinary introduction of young men to those associations and habits which lead to intemperance.

C. R. H.

DETROIT, November, 1890.

For THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

THE "CHURCH SUPPORT" SYMPOSIUM.

[Brief Reasons for Various Theories of Church Support.]

III.

SELF-SUPPORT.

BY REV. NEWTON WRAY, PASTOR OF M. E. CHURCH, LENOX, MASS., AUTHOR OF "FUN AND FINANCE," ETC.

Christian Offerings Ordained for Christian Work.

IN treating a subject, much depends upon the standpoint of observation. No subject, apart from its primary principles, can be intelligently discussed or righty understood. Error often thrives because there is no connection between the truth and its advocacy. The adoption of methods not in keeping with the cause they are meant to serve is fraught with incalculable mischief.

The bearing of these remarks on church support may be seen by reflecting on the struggle which some churches have to secure funds adequate to their needs, and the disparity between their opportunities and achievements. Church funds will not be wanting if the right course is pursued. To find this, we must inquire into first principles. My conviction is that it is time to lay the axe at the root of the tree, and remove a prolific source of evil by vindicating the divine idea of *Christian* offerings for Christian work.

Churches should support themselves, and not rely upon *ab extra* sources of income—*i.e.*, sources aside from the voluntary contributions of those who compose the churches. It is sometimes said that their maintenance is a matter of business, subject to the same financial policy that governs any honest enterprise. That there is a business element, none will deny. Collecting, receiving, and disbursing money involve this. It is so, also, in regard to work wholly charitable and benevolent. But the business feature must be consistent with the nature and design of the Church, and, therefore, preclude a resort to measures which may be allowable in secular, or moral, as distinguished from Christian undertakings.

Christians should conduct their temporal affairs in the spirit of devotion to the Lord. But this does not imply the right or propriety of a church paying its way by groceries and concerts, or by any means having respect to the fact rather than the manner of its support, and incompatible with its character and mission. If the Church were simply a social or business concern, its support might be made dependent on any plan not inimical to common morality. But if, as Scripture assumes, it is a divine institution, possessing a unique character, and founded for spiritual ends, it should be supported only in such a way as to maintain that character and accomplish those ends. It cannot be run on the bare theory of getting money, else all sorts of unseemly methods could be justified. The question to be kept in view is not merely how to obtain the money, but how to obtain it so as to promote the work for which the Church of God is instituted.

What is the Church? The body of believers—those *called out of* the world (such the original signifies) to "hold forth the word of life," and induce men to become saved. This comprehends their spiritual culture and growth. Now, any church that does not bear that character and achieve those results belies its name and sinks into a mere social, moral, or humanitarian organization. Churches, or assemblies of believers, ought to be visible embodiments of the Saviour's teaching respecting His Church. They can prove their title only by illustrating His Spirit and doing His work,

By seeking the aid of unconverted men. they insure failure in these respects. The independence so necessary to a faithful proclamation of God's Word is gone, when the gold of those liable to be offended by the truth is the object of solicitude and effort. And the spirit of Christian liberality, the best guarantee of supplies, remains unawakened or declines, where members seek to divide their responsibility with such persons. The unhappy effects of ignoring the principle here laid down must not be overlooked in this discussion. It could be shown that not the least serious one is the imagined necessity of extraneous help, and the sure diminution, in the long run, of the church finances. What else could be expected of a course contrary to God's revealed will? Only the believer's offering is acceptable to Him (Lev. 2 : 13, Mark 9 : 49–50, Prov. 15 : 8). Salted offerings mean that the offerer sustains a covenant relation to God, all his gifts being the token of a renewed and trusting heart, "being sanctified by the Holy Ghost" (Rom. 15 : 16). This truth is brought out in Psalm 50 : 7–23. The Church cannot worship with unconsecrated gifts.

Primitive Christians knew no dependence on "outsiders" for support (3 John 7) and for the reasons noted. Did they lack funds? Let the apostolic churches and those that now imitate them witness. Let church-members apply the same rule of expenditure to the house of God as to their own, and the question of church support would be settled. "Is it a time for you, O ye, to dwell in ceiled houses, and this house lie waste?" On the other hand, a man who well-nigh bankrupts himself in building a house is called foolish. Can man's folly be a church's wisdom? Aspiring to church magnificence may be a sign of pride rather than of Christian devotion. A congregation that erects a house of worship out of proportion to its financial ability courts disaster, if it does not resign its influence for the world's assistance.

Adherence to the true principle of church support permits some latitude for ways not opposed to it. Giving should be voluntary and direct, whether solicited or not. A church may accomplish much by judicious committees. Above all, let the example of liberal giving be set by those in authority, and the rank and file will act correspondingly. An eminent clergyman and his official members, having in view some Christian enterprise, met for consultation. The pastor suggested that they could not reasonably ask God's blessing until they themselves had liberally contributed. They, pastor and leaders, did so; then prayed for divine assistance. From that hour gifts flowed in, and there was abundant provision. He who declares, "the silver and the gold are mine," will stir up willing givers, when His pleasure is sought.

II.

Rented Pews.

BY THE REV. GEORGE R. VAN DE WATER, D.D., RECTOR OF ST. ANDREW'S CHURCH, NEW YORK.*

We are not disposed to reason with men who talk about things in the abstract when we undertake to write on the subject of church support. We are not angels, but men. We are not living ideal lives, but very real ones. In the matter of church support we are unable to legislate on any higher plane than practical efficiency will warrant. I freely admit that the ideal church is one sufficiently endowed to have all of its sittings declared free to worshippers. Very few of our churches have any endowment. Marvellously few have endowments sufficient to make their support entirely independent of any income derived from other sources. For the vast majority of our churches the problem of support is simply this, how best to secure from the regular worshippers a steady income sufficient for all needs. Dismissing, therefore, all theory, discarding all ideals, let us discuss this problem in a common-sense, business-like way.

---

* Owing to an unfortunate circumstance, portions of this article were omitted last month. In justice to its author, we gladly give the article in full in this number.

In the first place, the church, if true to duty, must have an income that will provide for its own support, and in addition to this meet the recognized claims of parochial, city, diocesan, and general missions and charities.

In my judgment, for an unendowed parish church in a city or a community, where worshippers at the principal services attend in sufficient numbers to fill all the sittings, this support can best be secured by renting the pews. In country places, or in parishes of the city, where regular attendants do not fill the church, and where the services are attended by the same people throughout the whole year, the question of renting pews, or making them free, and soliciting subscriptions by envelope is not a serious one. The results are the same in either case. The same people will occupy the same pews, and the envelope pledge will be an exact substitute for the weekly amount of pew rent. But in churches where for summer months a large portion of the congregation is absent, and during winter months the regular congregation fill the pews, the rental of pews will always prove the most satisfactory, and always provide the most regular and plenteous support.

The advantages of pew rents over free churches are these. They enable families to sit together—a great consideration for the children; they insure a steady revenue at a season of the year when parishioners in large numbers are absent; they enable a vestry to forecast with some degree of certainty the probable income, and then wisely to provide for the annual expenses; they relieve the rector from a vast amount of worry, and the people from unusual and constant solicitations; they furnish the opportunity for giving to charities and missions through the offertory.

The only objections to pew-rented churches are the staple ones of which so much has been made—namely, that such a system is unscriptural, and, second, that such a system is uncharitable and unchristian.

Fully conceding that if a church is free from debt, and provided with ample endowment for all its expenses, that it would be a selfish thing for such a church to rent its pews, I am prepared to maintain that for a church not free from debt, and without other means of support than the offerings of its people, renting pews is in every way desirable, and in no way whatever unchristian.

The radical free churchman proves too much when he undertakes to show from St. James that renting a pew is unscriptural, or from actual experience that renting pews is uncharitable.

As between renting a pew for a fixed sum and asking a pledge for a fixed sum, there is no difference. As for giving use of a pew for a consideration and assigning a pew for a consideration there is no difference. My own experience justifies me in saying that there have been no less troubles arising from want of courtesy and reasonable consideration of strangers' rights in a free church than in one the pews of which are rented.

Until we have our churches free from debt and endowed, the majority of them, in large cities especially, will rent their pews. God's work will be done in such churches in large measure, the poor will be ministered to in such churches in large numbers, and the time of the clergy will be occupied in other and better things than serving the tables of finance.

THE MONTH'S MIND.

October shares with May the honor of being the month of religious anniversaries. The "May meetings," which once used to be the great event of the year in more than one religious body, have long since become jejune and wearisome both to spirit and flesh. This is not so much due to a decline of interest in the great missionary enterprises at home and abroad, as to the way these enterprises are "run." There is a strange and instructive likeness between what we may term Church politics and the politics of the wicked world. The ecclesiastical "machine" is twin to the political "machine." Each has its "rings" and its "bosses," its caucuses and its "wire-pulling" and "laying pipes." Societies that have fallen under the domination of a clique, and have reduced their annual proceedings to a cut-and-dried routine, with platform oratory of the gushy and frothy type added as a make-weight, are regarded with a languid indifference by the public. In politics if the voters dislike the methods of the "machine," they abstain from the polls or vote for the opposing party's candidates; in Church politics they stay away from the anniversaries and send their contributions elsewhere. Occasionally they pluck up spirit enough to organize a revolt against machine methods. This was what certain Congregationalists did several years ago, when a clique of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions undertook to proscribe a minority of the body as heretical, though they were in full church and denominational fellowship, and were sustained by a large number of the strongest churches—strongest in social influence as well as in numbers or wealth—in the constituency of the Board. The meeting of this Board at Minneapolis was perhaps the most notable of the October anniversaries, because there was a "burning issue" to be decided, the peace and unity of the Congregational churches hanging on the decision. It is gratifying that the "machine" was broken, that counsels of wisdom and Christian love prevailed, and that a *modus vivendi* was agreed upon by the opposing parties, through which peace with honor is achieved for all. The chief complaint has been that a single officer has practically decided questions for the entire Board, and that he has subjected young men, candidates for missionary service, to a style of catechising and cross-examination more severe than is usual when the same young men are examined for ordination by Congregational councils. If any wavered under this test they were rejected. In the future this inquisitorial power is taken from the Secretary. After the first preliminary correspondence with the candidates, the Secretary is required to lay all the correspondence and facts before the Prudential Committee, and if they are not satisfied with the candidate's statement further examinations are to be had in open meeting, at which any friend of the candidate is privileged to be present. The right is also given to the candidate to express his statement of belief in the terms of any well-known Confession of Faith in common use among the Congregational churches, and he is simply required to answer the question, Do you hold any views at variance with these doctrines? and not as heretofore, Have you any doubts about any of the doctrines? The fact is wisely recognized that many candidates for the ministry and missionary service have had, in the course of their studies, doubts suggested to their minds which have not yet crystallized into convictions at variance with the doctrines commonly received, and no fact is better understood than that such academic doubts speedily vanish when the young man exchanges speculation for experience. Several times during the past few years it has seemed as if a division in the Congregational body could hardly be avoided, but the Minneapolis settlement of the debated questions, if it is fairly and candidly applied to such facts as hereafter arise, will allay the existing discontent and will preserve Congregationalists as a unit, in their missionary operations at all events. That the principles will be candidly applied as occasion demands, the constitution of the Prudential Committee and the character of the President of the Board furnish an ample guarantee.

⁂

The State Conventions of Societies of Christian Endeavor were not so publicly conspicuous as some of the other October gatherings, but to one who has an eye to discern the signs of the times, they were the most meaningful of all. Again the Scripture is justified, "The kingdom of heaven cometh not with observation," for when was there ever a movement in the Christian Church promising consequences so momentous, to which so little publicity was given? Promising, does one say? The Christian Endeavor movement is no longer promise, but performance, and performance on a scale truly marvellous. In Boston—staid, sober, cultured Boston, where the May meetings attract possibly an audience of five hundred if the weather is exceptionally good, and there is no hippodrome or ball-match as a counter-attraction—between three thousand and four thousand delegates came together and conducted enthusiastic meetings in the interest of the Endeavor work. In nearly all the Northern and Western States similar conventions have been held. These meetings have been noticeable for other things than their large attendance and enthusiasm. At most of the conventions the delegates have reaffirmed their evangelical basis of fellowship. In this they were entirely justified, and those who have taken occasion because of it to accuse them of sectarianism have misjudged the case. Christian Endeavor societies were of evangelical origin, and from the first were affiliated on the basis of evangelical fellowship, and only societies connected with evangelical churches have been enrolled at the Boston headquarters. In this respect the Christian Endeavor work stands on precisely the same basis as the Christian Association and the Evangelical Alliance, welcoming to membership all members of evangelical churches, yet at the same time not antagonizing those who do not conform to this test. Another marked feature of the meetings this year has been the emphasis given to one of the fundamental, but misunderstood, principles of the organization—namely, that each local Christian Endeavor society owes its first and chief allegiance to the church of which it is a part. The design of the Central society is simply to act as a useful auxiliary, an educational and unifying force, but in no way to interfere with the relations of local societies to their churches. There are some, however, who are denominationalists first and Christians afterward, and to people of this type of mind there has seemed to be a grave danger in permitting the young in the churches to form affiliations of any sort with outside organizations that are not strictly denominational. Others have favored a strictly denominational organization of the young people from motives more respectable than this, and so it has come to pass that, in at least two of the largest religious bodies, a distinctively denominational work has been begun that promises to reach large proportions. First and oldest of these is the Epworth League of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which already numbers its adherents by the tens of thousands. Among Western Baptists a similar movement has been begun during the last year under the name of "The Loyalists," and in several Western States conventions of young Loyalists were held in connection with the regular October State denominational meetings. Whereunto this may grow no one can at present say, but there seems less tendency in the Eastern States to distinctive denominational work among the young people than has manifested itself in the West. It seems unfortunate that a work of this kind should be divided by sectarian feeling, especially when so little cause for such divisions exists; but it is possible that, like other similar divisions, this may in the end result in greater efficiency and a larger volume of work than would be achieved by the single organization.

⁂

At the meetings of the State Conference of Baptist Pastors at Lockport, N. Y., there was a very spirited, not to say heated, discussion of a proposition submitted by a committee of the Presbyterian Synod of New York. The proposition seemed innocent, it being that the Baptist pastors send a delegation to a conference on certain reforms in our public schools, to be held in New York City, November 17th. A somewhat incautious use of the phrase "religious instruction" in the official communication of the Synod led to a misunderstanding with regard to the end proposed. A careful perusal of the Synod's programme shows one that the chief end sought is the teaching of elementary morals in public schools. But every one admits that moral instruction, to be of any real value and to take any grip upon the character, must rest upon such fundamental religious truth as the being of God, the responsibility of the human soul to God, and retribution for sin. Both from the official publications of the Synod, and from explanations made by members of the committee, it is apparent that no religious instruction is sought other than this. The Baptist pastors passed resolutions opposing the giving of religious instruction in the schools, as in effect an approval of the union of Church and State. The object of the resolutions was a praiseworthy one, to reaffirm the "doctrine of soul liberty for all men as well as ourselves, and of the non-interference of the State with the Church in her peculiar function of teaching religion." But it is not well to imagine dangers where none exist, or to see a serious menace to civil and religious freedom in the most harmless proposition. There is not the slightest danger of our schools teaching an excessive quantity of religion, or of any union between Church and State based on such teaching. The great trouble with our public schools to-day, as the Synod recognizes and as Christian parents recognize, is that, while they are nominally neutral as regards religion, they are really teaching agnosticism and infidelity with great energy and success. Something might be done, should be done, to remedy this. We do not say that the Presbyterian Synod has discovered the best remedy, but it would certainly not harm Christian men of any and every faith to come together and discuss a question of so grave importance.

The sensational account published by the London *Times* of a new persecution of the Jews begun by special decree of the Czar of Russia, turns out to be largely untrue. No new decree has been promulgated. It was not necessary, indeed, that laws more stringent or inhuman should be made with regard to the treatment of the Jews, for an edict published in 1882 reached the extreme of cruel and unjust treatment. By the terms of that edict Russian Jews were compelled to reside thereafter only in certain designated towns. None were permitted to own land or to hire it for agricultural purposes; to hold shares in or work mines; to hold positions under the Government; to enter the army or any of the professions. Their residence was confined by this edict to sixteen of the provinces of Russia, and they were forbidden under the severest penalties to change their domicile. This edict has, however, been largely a dead letter. Anything can be bought in Russia, and the Jews who have had the means have purchased immunity from these restrictions, so that they have lived practically where they pleased, and engaged in whatever callings they pleased. What has occurred within the past few weeks is the manifestation of a disposition on the part of the Russian Government to enforce the edict of 1882. It is said that this will involve the emigration of fully a million Hebrews from their present homes. They must either submit to be herded together in the most unhealthy regions of the empire and in the few cities and towns where they are permitted to reside, or they must seek a residence in another country. It is more than probable that the great majority will adopt the latter alternative. It is understood that large sums have been subscribed or pledged to remove the poorer Hebrews of Russia to a freer land and to more hopeful prospects in life; and no doubt, sooner or later, a large proportion of them will find their way to the United States. To this there can be no reasonable objection, if the emigration project includes the supplying of each emigrant with sufficient funds to enable him to buy land or begin some sort of business venture in this country, and so insure his self-support. A warm welcome will hardly be extended to those who come here destitute of everything, only to become objects of public charity at the outset.

* * *

A law when passed often has an effect not merely quite different from that expected from it, but totally unforeseen. And this is the more likely to be the case when legislation is crude and hasty. The silver bill passed at the last session of Congress is an admirable instance of this. It was put together in a particularly haphazard way, the House and Senate being at cross purposes, striking out a clause here and adding an amendment there until neither body had any very definite idea as to the effect of the measure. What probably none of the supporters of the bill anticipated, or so much as thought of, was the effect that it would have upon foreign missions carried on by American Christians. These missionary operations involve large financial transactions. The expenses of conducting the Asiatic missions, excepting those in Syria, are met by bills of exchange on London payable at the missions in silver (rupees). The passage of the silver bill has so disturbed the silver market as to cause a rise in the rate of exchange amounting to threepence a rupee, with a probable rise of fourpence more. In many of our missionary organizations the estimates and appropriations are made in the Asiatic currency, and the finances of the missionary societies are arranged for the year on that basis. This rise in the rate of exchange will add over $50,000 to the appropriations of the American Baptist Missionary Union for the current year. The deficit in this case is larger, perhaps, than in any other one missionary organization, inasmuch as the Union's missions in British India are more extensive than those of any other missionary society. But the same effect will be felt in Chinese and Japanese missions, appropriations for them being made in the native silver currency, and the rise of exchange implying an increased expense to the societies in this country. An addition of 15 per cent or more to the expenses of the current year will be a serious burden on all our missionary organizations.

* * *

The most significant of recent events in the history of the "Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints," more commonly known as Mormons, is the adoption by their general conference of a "Declaration" made by the President of the church, advising all Mormons for the future to abstain from contracting plural marriages. It was somewhat hastily concluded by many, with whom the wish was father to the thought, that this indicated an intention on the part of the Mormon authorities definitely and irretrievably to abandon both the doctrine and practice of polygamy. A closer examination of the documents in the case has perhaps convinced those who have examined them that the Mormon leaders have no such intention. The action of their conference was advice, not prohibition. They repealed no previous declaration, they changed no existing law of the church. They merely advised their people to bow to superior force, to cease defying the Government of the United States, and to obey its laws; not because the laws were in themselves righteous or equitable, but because the United States had the power and the will to enforce them. There is no man in public life who has more carefully studied the Mormon question than Senator Edmunds of Vermont. To him is chiefly to be attributed such legislation as has been effective in bringing the Mormon Church to its present state of mind. Mr. Edmunds puts no trust in the good faith of the Mormon leaders. He evidently believes that it would be safer to wait till they have brought forth fruits meet for repentance before the fatted calf is killed. There is nothing, as he points out, to prevent the Mormon Church, if Utah should become a State, from retracing its steps and enacting laws that would make plural marriages valid. Nevertheless, due weight must be attached to the fact that Governor Thomas, a resolute and intelligent man, believes that the Mormons have acted in good faith. And much is to be said in favor of the view advocated by many that, no matter what was the intention of President Woodruff and his followers, they have given polygamy its deathblow. It is an institution that has been able to maintain itself until this time only by virtue of the fact that Utah has been from the first an isolated community. Since the rapid settlement of the great West has greatly encroached upon this isolation, and is rapidly incorporating Utah with American civilization, this relic of the barbarous age of mankind has been doomed. Once the practice has ceased, it cannot be restored. It would be easier to put Humpty Dumpty together again than to put new vitality into a religious delusion that has once been exploded.

ONE of the most encouraging signs of the times is the increased attention given in our best colleges to the study of the Bible. A chair for the promotion of Bible study has recently been endowed at Princeton. At Yale, under the enthusiastic instruction of Professor W. R. Harper, large classes have been formed for the study of the English Scriptures, sixty-seven seniors and ninety-two juniors taking a course of two lectures a week on the Old Testament during the current year, while Oriental history, with special reference to the Bible, is now a required study of the Freshman year. It is gratifying to know that similar instruction is given at Amherst College and at McMaster University, Toronto. Probably other institutions of which we have not heard have arranged similar courses. In the earlier days of the American college, instruction in the Scriptures was a matter of course, but of late years the curriculum has made little or no provision for this kind of study. A perfunctory and makeshift recitation one hour of the week in the Greek Testament, generally on Monday morning, has been the only study of the Scriptures in most colleges, and many have lacked even that. But perfunctory and makeshift work will not do. There must be ample time for thorough preparation both on the part of students and instructors, and the work must be made as thorough a mental discipline as any other part of the curriculum. There is no reason why the same accurate and thorough scholarship should not be exacted as in any other branch of study. The result of the old method has been only a smattering of knowledge and the demoralizing of the students, for slipshod work in any department, if tolerated, tends to lower the standard of scholarship in every department. What is needed above all, however, in this kind of study is the gaining of a thorough knowledge of the English Scriptures as history and literature. It is a disgrace for any one who considers himself, or wishes to be considered, a cultivated man not to know thoroughly the English Bible. No one can afford to be ignorant of it, considered purely as history and literature, apart from all considerations of its sacred character. If the Bible element in English literature could be blotted out, scarcely any English classic would be intelligible, so large a place do quotations from the text of the Scriptures and allusions to its incidents fill in all standard literature. And yet there is no book of which the average man—we had almost said the average minister—is so ignorant as the English Scriptures. Even graduates of theological seminaries, who can read the Scriptures fluently in the original Hebrew and Greek, and have learned a great deal about the science of exegesis, lack familiarity with the English Scriptures. How few Christian men can turn easily to any well-known passage of the Scriptures without the use of a concordance! How many fumble over the pages of their Bibles desperately in attempting to find one of the minor prophets! Could one in a thousand give off-hand the authorship of the principal books, the time approximately when they were written, and a brief analysis of their contents? But students are expected to acquire this kind of familiarity with the principal authors of classic and modern literatures; why should they not be equally familiar with their Bibles? Why should our Christian colleges graduate men who know their Homer and their Horace, but not the Psalms of David; who know Thucydides and Tacitus, but not Moses and the prophets?

A PROCESSION of fifty thousand people following through the streets of London on a raw, foggy day of November a plain hearse in which were the earthly remains of one who was not born to the royal purple, was not even a dame of high degree, but one of the so called "lower orders" of the people—this is surely an impressive and instructive sight. This last tribute of respect was paid to the wife of General Booth, the head of the Salvation Army, a woman who during her lifetime was perhaps the most influential in all England; strong by reason of her character and self-sacrificing devotion, not by any adventitious circumstances of wealth or worldly pomp. But next to this striking testimony to the respect and affection in which she was held by so many people of her race and country, the most impressive thing about these funeral services was their severe simplicity. Both Mrs. Booth and her husband have for a long time been strongly interested in the reform of funeral observances. The Salvation Army not long ago received general orders from its head, strictly limiting the pomp and expense of funeral services. The wearing of "mourning" has been altogether prohibited. The use of flowers and funeral paraphernalia in general has been either forbidden or, as far as possible, discouraged, and everything has been done to introduce simplicity and good taste in place of the lavish and vulgar expenditure that is so common both in England and in our own country. But, however much a compact organization of this kind may be able to accomplish, it is not probable that the general usages of society with regard to funeral services can be seriously modified except by those who are regarded as the arbiters of fashion. There is nothing about which people are more sensitive than the showing of due respect to their dead. It is a highly commendable trait of human nature that this is so. Rather than be thought lacking in respect and affection for one who is gone, the families of the poor will load themselves with crushing burdens of debt in order that they may as nearly as possible imitate the customs of those who are richer than themselves. When display is fashionable, any family that does not make a display is thought either to advertise its poverty or to be lacking in respect for the dead. It may be a foolish pride that shrinks from the danger of such misconstruction, but so long as human nature remains what it is this pride will be a prime motive. Hence any reform in social customs must come from above downward. The rich, to whom lavish expenditure is no burden, must for the sake of their poorer friends and neighbors curtail this expenditure.

⁂

THE disaster that has overtaken those rash young men who undertook a "crusade for missions" in the firm belief that ordinary common sense was of no use, and that God would suspend the laws of nature in their behalf, ought to be a warning to any others attempting like acts of faithless folly. It is not faith in God that impels men to cast aside the teachings of his providence, but lack of faith. A man who swallows a dose of arsenic and expects God to save him from the consequences of his rash act is not more wicked than one who recklessly exposes himself to jungle fever and sunstroke and all the other dangers of a new and untried climate, and expects to escape the inevitable consequences of such conduct through the special favor of God. A great deal has been said of late years by a few hare-brained enthusiasts about the duty of the Christian Church to engage in what they style "Matt. x. missions." As the early disciples were sent forth without purse or scrip and with no provision for the future, so they hold that Christian missionaries should now go forth to the ends of the earth in simple reliance upon God, living with the natives and as the natives, and trusting for their support wholly to the voluntary gifts of those to whom they preach the Gospel of Christ. These missionary suicides that have been recently reported, for such they surely are, are a sufficient commentary on the practical wisdom of this method of Christian work. The experience of the Christian Church for nineteen centuries ought to count for something in the interpretation of God's Word, and as a guide to the lines along which divine providence intends the evangelization of the world to be carried forward.

⁂

If October is the month of conventions, November is as distinctly the month of Church Congresses. Two meetings of this kind have been held during the past month—the Protestant Episcopal Church Congress at Philadelphia and the Baptist Congress at New Haven. It is difficult to see why these bodies should be a permanent institution. The idea that originally inspired them was that they gave opportunity for a freer platform discussion of topics of current interest than was always permissable or desirable in the ordinary official gatherings. There are many subjects that are in the air and about which every one is thinking more or less, of which an official body would naturally be shy; which, indeed, could not be discussed in official gatherings, as a rule, without stepping aside from the avowed and recognized work of such bodies. What has a missionary organization or a diocesan convention to do with questions like state socialism, probation after death, the short-cut theological training, and other like topics? The discussion of these is the theoretical justification for the meeting of the various congresses. They are in no sense representative bodies. Any one may attend them, and almost any one may take part in the general discussions, after the appointed speakers have been heard. There is no practical outcome of the debate, the body from the nature of the case undertaking to do no work, and as a body expressing no opinion even. The congress is a collection of units, each of whom stands by himself. It possibly affords a safety-valve for the crank and the incipient heretic—men who might become troublers in Zion if they were not afforded this opportunity of giving vent to their peculiar theories. It must be said, however, that from year to year the programmes of the congresses tend to become more and more commonplace and orthodox. The new questions are soon talked out, the daring and rash thinkers cease to attract attention by their rashness and daring, and the whole proceedings, while perhaps they gain in general ability, lose the exceptional and slightly sensational character that they at first seemed to have. At neither of the congresses above named during their session this year was there anything specially noteworthy said—noteworthy, that is to say, from the point of view of the sensational newspaper. There was no heresy broached, there was nothing said that offered the opportunity to the fertile reporter for what is known in the profession as "scareheads." Many able papers were read, many pungent and witty remarks were made, but as a whole the proceedings must be pronounced decidedly tame. We fear that unless the congresses manage to introduce a judicious mixture of startling heresy they will die in a few years of inanition.

⁂

It is a curious fact that only one topic seemed really to stir the pulses in these congresses, and that the topic was the same in either case. The methods of statement differed, naturally, but the theme was church unity. Nothing could more strongly testify to the fact that men are thinking of this subject, that it is "in the air," as we say. It would have been a significant thing if two Christian gatherings of this kind had by prearrangement selected this topic for simultaneous discussion, but that they lighted on it independently surely proves that it is one of the real questions of the day—questions that will not down, but clamor for solution. But perhaps the strangest coincidence was the substantial identity of treatment that the question received in the two congresses. This was certainly not a thing to be inferred *a priori*. On the contrary, a reasonable *a priori* inference would have been that the Church Congress would advocate and the Baptist Congress oppose an organic union of evangelical Christian bodies on the basis of the historic creeds and the historic episcopate. The speakers in the Baptist Congress did incidentally take the line to have been expected of them, though their main idea was the possibility of unity of spirit in diversity of form. A union of will, of love, of vital power, a unity whose characteristic is action, co-operation—this was the drift of the debate. Said one speaker, the Rev. C. D'W. Bridgman, D.D., pastor of the Madison Avenue Baptist Church of New York:

"And it will show itself, further, in co-operation—in some method, some plan, whereby the resources of the churches shall no longer be wasted, but economized, and directly employed in bringing the poor and sinful and wretched to know how much there is for them in the Gospel of Christ. Day by day the need of such concert of action grows more apparent. Villages are everywhere to be found where there are more churches than there is any real need for, and which men far and near are asked to help to support; and because of the rivalries between them communities are divided, and the very Gospel is made an occasion of strife. Sectarian propagandists are encouraged beyond those whose one purpose is to bring men to Christ. All over the land the zeal to make proselytes is out of all proportion to the zeal for the improvement of the moral and spiritual life of mankind. Is it strange if society is growing weary of hearing more of the differences between the different denominations than of the truths in which they agree? Is it strange that Christian men and women, impatient of the narrowness and sluggishness of ecclesiastical leaders, are organizing societies to do what united churches should do, but what no one of them by itself can accomplish? And this is going on every day because we are dreaming that our duty is mainly to bring men to our way of thinking, and that it is on their acceptance of our doctrines and ordinances that unity must depend. It is the folly and sin of all the denominations in Christendom. Great enterprises demand massed efforts; and if the churches are to conquer the evils which are involved with our social conditions, it will be done only by their acting in concert, under the direction of the interdenominational wisdom in the several communities, and with something of the high purpose and passion of Christ. The aspirations and struggles of labor point to a time when co-operation shall be established as the relation between masters and workmen for the advantage of both ; and the movement of the Christian spirit as expressed in such proposals as I have referred to, intimates that the time is at hand when the inner, spiritual union of Christians will be made visible to the world in forms of united endeavor for the renewal of the life of society. In some way the work has to be done. The denominations that do most to bring about this practical unity will have most of the blessing of God. They will find that strength comes, not through the glorifying of sect, but through oneness in the spirit and purpose of Christ ; and then they will wonder that men and money and opportunities were wasted for so long where the law of life was so plainly declared—the law for churches as for individual men—' he that loseth his life for My sake, the same shall save it.' "

An equally catholic and eloquent plea for practical unity, if one may judge from the imperfect reports of it, was made in the Church Congress by Archdeacon Alexander Mackay Smith. He did not so much oppose as pass by the idea of organic unity, to urge the more pressing need and practical policy of unity in Christian work. The idea of a speedy outward union of Christians, however alluring it may be, is not one that is cherished by men of clear vision. No good is accomplished by fostering hopes impossible of accomplishment. A wise man may, must, have before him high ideals, but he does not because of this lose his lucidity of sight and thought. Organic union is a lofty ideal, not at present a practical aim ; but unity in Christian work—that is feasible, sensible, and it will be the common shame of Christendom if progress is not rapidly made along this line during the next decade.

PARAGRAPHIC.

Coming down the Nile.—Some years ago an Englishman was coming down the Nile, in Egypt, on a large boat loaded with grain, and the birds came off from every village and ate the grain piled on the deck. The Englishman asked the Egyptian captain of the boat, " Who owns this grain ?" The Egyptian captain said, " I own it." Then the Englishman asked why he let the birds eat of the grain. The Egyptian asked the Englishman, " Who made the birds ?" The Englishman answered, " God." The Egyptian asked " whether grain was a food which God intended birds to eat ;" the Englishman said " it was." The Egyptian said, " Can the birds sow and raise the grain for themselves ?" The Englishman said " they cannot." " Then," said the Egyptian, " let them eat. God has provided enough for both them and us."—*Christian Leader, Boston.*

Seldom has the history of a potentate presented such a many-sided aspect as that of Mwanga, the expelled King of Uganda. He was expelled from his throne with the co-operation of the missionaries for his cruel deeds. When Mwanga came into power almost his first act was to celebrate the event by the murder of Bishop Hannington and by the hideous massacre of the Christian Readers in 1886. It was he who employed his soldiers for hunting down slaves to be sold to the Arab dealers. Scores of the native Christians were put to death by burning, it being offence enough that they had learned to read in the missionary schools. Yet he himself had attended those schools and had learned to read a little. Mwanga being deposed, his brother Kiwewa succeeded to the throne. He showed favor to missionaries, which in turn caused his deposition by the Arabs. Another revolution restores Mwanga to power, and he declares himself to be henceforth a protector of the missionaries. The white population of the Congo has increased very rapidly the past four years, and there is every probability now that Mwanga will see the folly of fighting against the inevitable, and that with the change of circumstances, his inclinations and his self-interest will lead him to be as stout a protector of the missionaries as in the past he has been their most relentless and cruel persecutor.—*Christian at Work.*

Along the valley of the Nile from Alexandria to the first cataract are seventy-nine mission stations and seventy Sabbath-schools, numbering 4017 scholars, while the day and boarding schools have over 5000 pupils. There has been an increasing demand for Bibles, 6651 having been sold last year, with 8933 volumes of religious literature and 17,179 educational books.—*Universalist, Chicago.*

That stirring revival " hymn," " Hold the Fort," is, so far as the music is concerned, an ancient German *drinking* song, says the New Orleans *Picayune.* If this be so, and if the rest of the drinking songs are of a similar intellectual calibre, we wonder Prohibition does not make more headway in the Fatherland !—*Standard of the Cross, Philadelphia.*

The nickel-in-the-slot machine is not by any means a modern invention. In the old Egyptian temples devices of this kind were employed for automatically dispensing the purifying water. A coin of five drachmæ dropped into a slot in a vase set a simple piece of mechanism like a well-sweep in motion, a valve was opened for an instant, and a portion of the water permitted to escape. This apparatus was described by Hero, of Alexandria, who lived 200 years before the Christian era. The work, of course, is written in Latin, but the description is accurate. The question is, Who adopted the ancient Egyptian's idea to the wants of the money-making citizen of the nineteenth century ? —*The Independent, New York.*

It is related of Pope Clement XIV. that, when he ascended the papal chair, the ambassadors of the several States represented at his court waited on him with their congratulations. When they were introduced and bowed, he returned the compliment by bowing also, on which the master of the ceremonies told his Highness that he should not have returned their salute. " Oh, I beg your pardon," said the good pontiff ; " I have not been pope long enough to forget good manners."—*Christian Register, Boston.*

Mr. Pewrent : " Your sermon on ' Economy' this morning, doctor, was a sensible discourse." Dr. Churchmus : " Thank you ; it seems to have been appreciated from the appearance of the contribution basket."—*Reformed Church Record, Reading, Pa.*

It is announced that Dr. Liddon has left considerable sums of money both to Keble College and the Pusey House. During the Canon's travels in the East, some few years ago, he had been accompanied throughout the entire expedition by a more than usually attentive and obliging dragoman, to whom he proceeded to testify his gratitude by a proportionately large amount of backsheesh. Two days later the delighted dragoman called on Dr. Liddon, and exhibited with grateful pride the new wife which his liberal donation had enabled him to add to his establishment.—*Living Church, Chicago.*

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Handbook of Scientific and Literary Bible Difficulties; or, Facts and Suggestions helpful toward the Solution of perplexing things in Sacred Scripture. Being a second series of the "Hand book of Biblical Difficulties." Edited by Robert Tuck, B.A., (London). New York: Thomas Whittaker. 8vo, pp. vi., 566. Cloth, $2.50.

It is only fair to say that a considerable number of the "difficulties" mentioned in this volume are such as would not be suggested to the average reader of Scripture. Some of them are merely questions which arise as to the significance of this or that statement or occurrence. Still there are many matters which occur to the intelligent and careful reader as presenting questions which are worthy of solution, and which the editor, as he modestly subscribes himself, attempts to unravel. Everywhere he has succeeded in bringing together a considerable amount of information which will be useful to those for whom the book is intended. He has proposed only to present the several explanations which have been suggested, and points out the particular one which seems most fully to meet the case, while leaving the reader free to make his own choice. It is not alleged that every difficulty has been met, but so far as explanations have been attempted, he has endeavored to present them by quotation or in condensed form. One criticism which lies on the surface is that the editor has omitted all reference to the exact source of a given quotation. The name of the author is given, and sometimes one can guess whence it comes, but in far the larger number of cases there is no clue.

The method of procedure is as follows: Under the heading which marks a given section, the Scripture passage is quoted in which a "difficulty" is found, or which suggests a subject which may be profitably explained. Then a question is printed or a statement made in italics, which presents in brief form the matter to be discussed. Under the heading "Explanation," the author proceeds as seems to be required, giving the results of his own reading, or giving extracts from various authors bearing upon the point in hand.

There is a considerable amount of introductory matter in the volume, but instead of being placed all together, just after the preface, like a wall that must first be surmounted, it is judiciously scattered through the book at such places as seem to require it. The scope of the present volume is confined to matters of history, science, ancient religion, and language.

The object of the editor is a most worthy one. He has attempted to bring down to date and properly digest and arrange the information on many topics which is scattered through many books and magazines, in publications which are accessible only to the few. His selections are judicious, and usually very much to the point. The book is one which will prove of assistance to "Bible readers, Bible students, and Bible teachers." While he may not have added very much to the stock of information in existence, the editor has rendered a service in gathering facts and opinions from a great variety of sources, the main drawback being that he has failed to give citations of his sources for the benefit of those who might have desired to pursue matters further than he has here gone.

C. R. Gillett.

New York City.

Jesus of Nazareth. I. His Personal Character; II. His Ethical Teaching; III. His Supernatural Works. Three Lectures before the Young Men's Christian Association of Johns Hopkins University. By John A. Broadus, D.D. New York: Armstrong, 1890. Pp. 105, 12mo, cloth, 75 cents.

The limitations of the book are hinted on the title-page. But one familiar with recent literature will feel that the author has made a singularly happy selection of the three topics he has chosen to present. Of lives of Christ growing rhetorical over the imaginary scenes, or made imposing with their display of dubious Talmudic lore, we have had enough. But the revival, in our day, of the sense for Christ's real humanity, together with the reaction we are undergoing, for ourselves, from our deification of machinery, has immensely increased the interest in Jesus as a character. The author shows at every turn, and repeatedly acknowledges his indebtedness to the author of "Ecce Homo," who was certainly, for English readers, the originator here. The lack of devout warmth of which the author, in his preface, speaks, may easily be pardoned. The devout simplicity with which he has let the character shine forth in its own light is better far. It is the ethical aspect of Jesus teaching which, more than all others, demands the attention of the day. It is his moral teaching which has been, perhaps, most questioned of late years. This is due partly to the undoubted ethical revival in the world's thinking in the midst of which we are. Partly it is due to the dying of that distinction between the religious and the moral interest, which the friends of religion were once silly enough to make. It is a system of morals with sanction from the unseen that the age feels that it wants. And it is this which, in briefest outline and most successful summary of the discussion which has been going on for years, the author labors to present. The third lecture has less of unity in its material and treatment. One misses the consistent conclusiveness which characterize the first two chapters of the book. The subject matter of the essay perhaps brings that with it. Current discussion has here reached much less that is universally admitted. At the same time, with all the evidence of the widest and most thoughtful reading which the book presents, it has seemed to me that, even now, a more simple, graphic, and luminous impression of the whole question might be made. It is, perhaps, its greatest merit that the book is so small; its conciseness is worthy of the highest praise. It is certainly matter for gratification that such work should be unhesitatingly addressed to just such an audience. It assumes much, and tends to create more, of interest on the part of the whole class of educated men in this country, in the results, at any rate, of the best theological labor of the time. Edward C. Moore.

Providence, R. I., October 31, 1890.

Das Christenthum in seiner Begründung und seinen Gegensätzen. Christliche Apologetik auf anthropologischer Grundlage (Christianity in its Grounds and in its Oppositions. Christian Apologetics upon an Anthropological Basis). By Dr. Christian Edward Baumstark. Three volumes. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1889. (Gustav E. Stechert, 828 Broadway, New York.

In taking up a work of this kind for examination, one naturally desires to know in advance, if possible, the theological standpoint of the author.

He frankly says of himself that he was dissatisfied with the result of his theological studies in two universities, and felt the need of further and deeper research and independent study in order to obtain clear and settled convictions in regard to the Christian faith. In search of these he says: "On the one hand, I ventured into the camp of the enemies of Christianity, looking about in all directions, and not hesitating to follow the tracks of those who had gone farthest astray in irreligionism, even at the risk of losing my own faith in Christianity; and, on the other hand, I made myself thoroughly familiar with the apologetic literature of ancient and modern times, in the domain of both Protestant and Catholic theology, but especially examined Christianity itself in all its aspects, thoroughly and without prejudice."

He claims through studies of this character to have secured "the long needed and earnestly desired conviction of the truth of the Christian religion," and also to have been led to see "the untenableness of the antagonistic doctrines, which in their consequences run into the extreme of absurdity;" but he adds: "I realized also the unsatisfactoriness of previous works on the subject of Apologetics." "If we are to refute the objections of opponents, and to remove doubts that are presented to us, we need such an examination of the antagonistic doctrines as not only deals with their results in general, but also with the individual arguments, which only a specifically scientific work can accomplish. Many apologists, too, limit themselves with refuting the antagonistic systems of cosmogony, starting with the idea that if this is done, the truth of Christianity will follow as a matter of course. But this idea is totally false; for if we prove that the systems of naturalism, pantheism, etc., are untenable, it surely is not positively shown that Christianity is the absolute truth. The many questions that suggest themselves when we attentively consider Christianity are not thereby solved, indeed, hardly even touched. . . . A principal mistake, finally, is this, that Apologetics generally bases itself upon an authority, either that of the Church or that of the Holy Scriptures. But it is surely not scientific to go hunting, lawyer fashion, after proofs for what has already been authoritatively assumed."

"It would have been of great service to me could I have found a work already prepared that met the demands of science. But as I found none such, I resolved to undertake the matter myself, convinced that I would thereby meet the wants of my ministerial brethren and render a valuable service to the science of theology."

He deplores the present critical and almost comfortless (trostlos) condition of theology. He represents the historical basis of the Christian faith as having been shaken by the recent investigations of the critics; states that what is presented in the documents of the New Testament as original Christian doctrine has been reduced to the subjective views of the individual writers, who were to themselves more or less unclear; that the prevalent theory among the devotees of natural science regards the cosmogony that underlies the Christian faith as long since obsolete and absolutely untenable. He sees a similar hostility to exist between recent philosophy and theology, and sums up, as the result of the modern researches in natural and philosophical science, "that religion in all its grades, from Fetichism to Christianity, is explained as a psychologically comprehensible and even necessary *illusion*. Beyond this result theology, so far as it has entered with scientific earnestness into these investigations, has not advanced a single hair's breadth."

We are not told by our author what "two universities" it was at which he studied, but he seems to assume that the training usually given in those institutions does not fit a young man for the office and work of the holy ministry. "The Church usages have true significance only under the presupposition of the truth of the Church's faith." But "his knowledge [*i.e.*, his way of thinking acquired in the university] tells him the opposite of that which he is to announce from the pulpit, and of what lies at the basis of all his official acts."

The remedy for all these evils our author finds not in bridging over the gaping chasm between science and the Christian faith by an appeal either to the legitimately established confessions of the Church or to the Holy Scriptures, much less by a resort, after the manner of the theologians of the negative tendency, to "mere phrases, which all honorable and sensible men turn away from, since they recognize them as what they are, as lies." "It is only science itself that can quell the conflict between science and Christian faith. Reasons that thinking propounds against the doctrines of Christianity can be met only by counter reasons; and if Christianity is attacked as a whole it can be vindicated only by systematic thinking that connectedly embraces the whole. But this systematic vindication of Christianity is Apologetics. Apologetics is, therefore, the means whereby the antagonism between faith and knowledge, Christianity and science, can be overcome, the contents of Christianity be proved to possess the character of objective truth, and thereby the science that discusses these contents—namely, theology, be shown to be entitled to rank as a separate science. If it accomplishes this, it further mediates between science and Church usages, and ought to be admitted to the circle of theological lectures, while it has hitherto been left to each clergyman to find out as best he can what he is to do with the objections that are raised against that which he has to teach in church and school."

In the opinion of our author, a system of Apologetics adapted to meet our present wants must be absolutely impartial, must give due credit to the enemies of the truth when they deserve it, must ignore every species of authority, must base its reasons solely upon the human self-consciousness (he utterly repudiates the theory of an innate God-consciousness, *Gottesbewusstsein*, Vol. II., p. 195), and must hold in close contact the facts of our self-consciousness and Christianity in its essential particulars, in order to see whether in this we can find the satisfaction of our deepest needs, the solution of our highest questions. Only when this question has in this way been examined and affirmatively answered has Apologetics performed its task in a scientific manner."

Claiming to have thus impartially and thoroughly discussed the subject of Christianity, with its proofs and its antitheses, our author reaches the following conclusions:

"1. If one, leaving out of view all traditionary Church teaching, contemplates Christianity solely in the light of historical criticism, it reveals itself as the religion of redemption, resting upon special divine arrangement, objectively manifested in historical facts, and the imparted information explaining these. In the presence of these facts negative criticism stands confounded.

"2. The theology of liberal Protestantism, which turns into mere ideas the doctrines of Christianity and holds redemption to be only a subjective process, is an apostasy from Christianity, which it is sought to disguise only in an extremely artful and untruthful way.

"3. Only Christianity as the historically realized religion of redemption corresponds to our religious craving and our metaphysical needs; while in the extra-Christian religions the unappeased questioning and seeking for satisfaction makes itself felt, while the philosophical systems in their metaphysical consequences are totally untenable (haltlos).

"4. The only alternative, if we mean to think with logical consistency, is either to accept Christianity as the absolute religion, or, eschewing all supersensuous knowledge, to adopt *materialism*, with all its consequences, the ruin of all morality. But as the materialistic philosophy is shown to be untenable as well by anthropological facts as indeed by its consequences, there remains only *Christianity: the only metaphysical truth*, the sole means of *satisfying the human spirit destined for immortality.*"

CHARLES A. HAY.

GETTYSBURG, PA.

SEAT OF AUTHORITY IN RELIGION. By JAMES MARTINEAU, D.D., LL.D. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1890. Pp. xii., 664, 8vo, $4.50.

Dr. Martineau is one of the most important personalities in the religious world of to-day. He brings to the discussion of religious and philosophical questions a sweetness of spirit, a varied and profound learning, and a keenness of insight equalled by few, and a mastery of English equalled by no man now living.

In the volume before us he puts into words the great question which really underlies all the religious thinking of the time—When and what is the Authority in Religion? What sufficient reason and justification can any man give to himself for trying to follow the guidance and obey the monitions of religion? All men recognize that this is not easy to do. To be religious requires strenuous effort, and entails the necessity of irksome restraints. *Why* should he submit to them? And, having made up his mind to do so, *where* shall he look for the divine Imperative?

Dr. Martineau arrives at the answer which we have long believed to be the true and Christian one. The only authority which does or can speak with cogency is one which speaks from within. It is the Divine within every man which is the only authority which can finally exact obedience. This, it seems to us, is but to say that the "Spirit of God bears witness with our spirit;" that "the kingdom of God is within;" that the final moral compulsion is "the answer of a good conscience toward God."

But the author reaches the conclusion along a path where we watch him with profound interest, but along which we cannot walk with him.

He first examines the Protestant notion that the *Bible* is the sole authority, and sets it aside as impossible. He rejects it for the reason that it seems to him, after a careful and independent study of the Holy Scriptures, that they are not what they purport to be either as to authorship, date, contents, or trustworthiness.

But criticism is not his province. While he pursues it reverently, it becomes evident to all that he has neither the technical knowledge nor the habit of mind which would make his conclusions valuable.

He then pursues a similar course with the Roman notion that the *Church* is an ultimate and independent authority. Here his argument is vitiated by his prejudices. All men have prejudices—even Dr. Martineau. Those who have read his studies in Religion have noticed how impossible it is for an Independent and Unitarian to comprehend the mental attitude of an ecclesiastic and a sacramentarian.

His error seems to be in denying to the Bible and the Church that secondary and derived authority which is clearly theirs. He empties them of all meaning, and the place in which he finally sets them is one in which it is not worth while to make the effort which would be necessary to maintain them.

It is in his dealing with the ethical nature of man that Dr. Martineau stands pre-eminent. As to the origin of that nature, its processes, its powers, its limitations, its authority, his words are most weighty and his thought most luminous. His arraignment of the churches for their inability to see the facts of human nature and life as they are, and their subservience to a false and artificial anthropology, is something which should be laid to heart.

"The spreading alienation of the intellectual classes of European society from Christendom, and the detention of the rest in their spiritual culture at a level not much above that of the Salvation Army, are social phenomena which ought to bring home a very solemn appeal to the conscience of the stationary churches." Beyond question this is true, and the evil is due to a false anthropology more than to any theological error. The transcendent charm of Dr. Martineau is that, being himself filled with the very spirit of God, he is able to discern what is the spirit of man.

S. D. MCCONNELL.

PHILADELPHIA.

LEHRBUCH DER PRACTISCHEN THEOLOGIE. Von Dr. ALFRED KRAUSS, Ord. Professor der Theologie zu Strassburg. Erster Band: Allgemeine Einleitung, Liturgik, Homiletik. Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr (Gustav E. Stechert, 828 Broadway, New York).

The author in 1883 published a "Manual of Homiletics," but the present work is an entirely new one, using the former only as a suggestion of the points which needed to be more distinctly set forth. Dr. Krauss writes in a correct and forcible way, and treats his subject with fulness and accuracy.

The General Introduction gives an admirable conspectus of the literature from Chrysostom down to the present time, although, as is usual with German writers on theology, no reference is made to any American author. Then Dr. Krauss takes up the church, which he justly maintains is not coincident with the Kingdom of God, the church services and the theory of the same, which he considers to be that the church (*Heilsgemeinschaft*) edifies its own members and (*Heilsanstalt*) is a means of salvation to others. This excludes church government, pedagogy and missions, which he thinks belong rather to dogmatics and ethics.

Liturgics are divided into principial,[*] elementary, and constructive. The first he rests upon the priesthood of all believers, who are to worship not only individually, but as a body, and need to have the service so directed that each worshipper shall come into direct communion with his God. Under the second head the author begins by defining the relations between cultus and art, and maintains firmly that religious experience is never to be sacrificed for æsthetic interests; after which he discusses the elements of worship—prayer, psalmody, reading of the Scripture, confession of faith, sacred formulas (amen, etc.), preaching and symbols (lights in churches, crucifix), upon all of which points he speaks sensibly; and then turns to the externalities of worship, such as church architecture, times for service, church furniture and the clerical dress, as to which last he thinks that a peculiar garb corresponds to the Protestant idea of the minister as the leader of the people's devotions. The third head, constructive Liturgics, denotes those elements which make the worship a complete organism as a well-constituted whole. These are traced to their confessional origin, and then viewed in detail. They are the festivals of the church-year and the symbolic ordinances. Of the latter he specifies first the two sacraments and their ordination, confirmation, marriage and funeral services, concluding with such occasional services as dedication of a building, etc.

---

[*] The use of this exotic as a translation of the German *principielle* may be excused for the reason that there is no other single term in English which will express the principles or grounds that underlie any given theme. Certainly we have no corresponding adjective.

The rest of the volume is occupied with Homiletics. It begins with a review of the pulpit and pulpit training, good so far as it goes, but mainly confined to the Continent. Then comes the division into *material* homiletics, or what is to be preached (Scripture exposition, doctrine, morals), and *formal*, or how one is to preach. In his discussion of the former the author treats of the stuff for sermons in general, and then in reference to particular discourses, whether upon the greater or lesser festivals or at the administration of the sacraments, or on ordinary or extraordinary occasions. In regard to the latter, stress is laid upon the theme, the division, the introduction and the conclusion, after which style is discussed, with the mention of some common errors in the pulpit, and also a consideration of tropes and figures as a help to the proper presentation of the thought, the whole concluding with suggestions as to delivery and the preparation for it.

So far the treatise makes the impression of an acute and learned man treating an important theme with freshness and force. Dr. Krauss follows in no man's footsteps, although he is a disciple of Schleiermacher, but gives an independent and in the main correct view of Practical Theology within the limits he assigns to it. The book is, of course, calculated for the meridian of Germany; but if the second volume shall prove to be of the same character as the first, a translation of the whole would be an acceptable gift to the profession. The treatment is scientific, the temper is good, and the references to literature at the close of each section are full and valuable. Often it is a considerable advantage to have the truth presented from a point of view other than that to which one is accustomed.

T. W. CHAMBERS.

NEW YORK CITY.

MODERN IDEAS OF EVOLUTION AS RELATED TO REVELATION AND SCIENCE. By Sir J. WILLIAM DAWSON, C.M.G., LL.D., F.R.S., etc. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 12 Bible House; Chicago, 148 and 150 Madison Street. 12mo, pp. 240.

The discussion of the hypothesis of evolution in our day originated in the publication of Darwin's "Origin of Species," in 1859, more than thirty years ago. This discussion has been a very thorough one, theologians as well as scientists taking part therein, and so voluminous that the "literature of evolution" will, to-day, form a library of very respectable dimensions.

As in all such cases, the hypothesis has been modified from time to time to meet emergencies developed in the discussion, old arguments cast aside and new ones advanced; and this on the part of its assailants as well as its defenders. In such circumstances it is very desirable that we should have a statement of the present status of the discussion, both as it concerns the hypothesis itself and the arguments by which it has been supported. Such a statement Principal Dawson aims to give us in the little volume before us; and we know of no one who has taken part in the discussion thus far who is better fitted for this difficult task than he.

The hypothesis of evolution in its atheistic form—the form in which it was held by Charles Darwin, and has been defended by Professor Huxley—burdened as it is with all the objections to atheistic materialism—has never had many advocates in this country or in Great Britain; and at the present time, if we may trust the judgment of an able writer in the *Edinburgh Review* for April, 1888, "This theory, about which Darwin himself, before he passed away, spoke in vacillating terms, is already on its way to the lumber-room of discarded theories."

Of the hypothesis in general, at the present stage of the discussion, Principal Dawson writes: "It will be the safest as well as the most candid and truthful course, both for the scientific worker and the theologian, to avoid committing himself to any of the current forms of evolution. The amount of assumption and reasoning in a vicious circle involved in these renders it certain that none of them can long survive" (p. 228). And again, "The man who, in a popular address or in a text-book, introduces 'the descent of species' as a proved result of science, to be used in framing classifications and in constructing theories, is leaving the firm ground of nature and taking up a position which exposes him to the suspicion of being a dupe or a charlatan. He is uttering counterfeits of nature's currency. It should not be left to the theologians to expose him, for it is as much the interest of the honest worker in science to do this as it is that of the banker or merchant to expose the impostor who has forged another's signature" (p. 55).

From the beginning of this discussion evolutionists have avoided giving their hypothesis a concrete form, and persistently clung to statements of it in general terms—*e.g.*, evolution is "the transformation by successive differentiations of the homogeneous into the heterogeneous" (*Spencer*); "Descent with modification" (*Darwin*). In so far as I know, Darwin is the only one who has ever ventured to give us what he believed to be the evolutionary genealogy of man. In his "Descent of Man," Vol. II., p. 372, he writes: "Man is descended from a hairy quadruped, furnished with a tail and pointed ears, probably arborescent in its habits, and an inhabitant of the Old World. This creature, if its whole structure had been examined by a naturalist, would have been classed among the quadrumana, as surely as would the common and more ancient of the New World monkeys. The quadrumana and all the higher mammals are probably derived from an ancient marsupial, and this through a long line, either from some reptile-like or some amphibian-like creature, and this from some fish-like animal. In the dim obscurity of the past we can see that the progenitor of all the vertebrates must have been an aquatic animal, provided with bronchia, with the two sexes united in the same individual, and with the most important organs of the body, such as the brain and heart, imperfectly developed. This animal seems to have been more like the larva of our existing ascidians"—sea-squirts, as they are commonly called—"than any other known form." Such is an outline of man's evolutionary genealogy as given us by Darwin twenty years ago. Why is it that neither Huxley, nor Spencer, nor Grant Allen, nor any other of the numerous disciples of Darwin who have written books upon the subject, has ever attempted to complete this outline genealogy? Is it because this hypothesis, when thus embodied in particular forms, disgusts them? That, like Falstaff, in the company he had pressed into the King's service, they are ready to exclaim: "If I am not ashamed of my soldiers, I am a soused gurnet. No eye hath seen such scarecrows. I'll not march through Coventry with them, that's flat."

George D. Armstrong

Norfolk, Va.

Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament. Bearbeitet von Holtzmann, Lipsius, Schmiedel, und v. Soden. Dritter Band. Zweite Abtheilung. Hebraerbrief, Briefe des Petrus, Jakobus, Judas. Bearbeitet von H. v. Soden. Freiburg i. B.: Mohr, 1890. (Gustav E. Stechert, 828 Broadway, New York.) 8vo, pp. viii., 182.

Soden agrees with recent writers in declaring against the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, but he differs from most in this, that, as regards the name of the author, he neither votes for any existing hypothesis nor proposes a new one. The author of Hebrews was not a pupil of Paul, nor of the earlier apostles. He was a highly cultivated man, of independent views, at home in the Alexandrian and Philonean literature. He was surely acquainted with the Epistle to the Romans and with First Corinthians. A close relationship is said to exist between Hebrews, on the one hand, Ephesians and First Peter on the other.

Soden argues from internal grounds that the readers of the Epistle were not Jewish Christians, but Gentile converts. The Epistle shows, he thinks, that the readers were not in danger of falling away into Judaism, but into unbelief.

The lack of an epistolary introduction, and the alleged omission of the superscription in the earliest copies of the Epistle, are thought to confirm the author's view that it is a circular letter.

All suggestions regarding the readers—the secondary character of their evangelization, bloody persecutions in the past, renewal of these in the present, together with the dependence of the Epistle upon Romans, and Clement's early appreciative use of it, are held to suit and support the hypothesis, based on xiii. 24, that the readers were in Rome and elsewhere in Italy.

The Epistle is said to be constructed according to the principles of Greek art, and to consist of four parts: Procemium (i. 1–iv. 13), Explanation (iv. 14–vi. 20), Demonstration (vii. 1–x. 18), and Epilogue (x. 19–xiii. 21). In the commentary this division is replaced, in part, by a different one.

Against Weiss, but in agreement with many recent writers, Soden holds that the readers of First Peter were Gentiles. The author of the Epistle was Silvanus, who in v. 12 represents himself as the amanuensis of Peter. It was an act of piety on the part of Silvanus to write in the name of Peter. Silvanus probably wrote in Rome, figuratively styled Babylon, and in the time of Domitian, where Soden also puts the Apocalypse. In favor of Rome as the place of composition is the name Babylon (v. 13), for there is no trace of a mission of Peter to Babylonia; also the dependence of the Epistle on that to the Romans.

The Second Epistle of Peter is placed in the second quarter of the second century. There is strong internal evidence against its having been written by the author of the First Epistle. The readers were Gentile Christians. As regards the relation of the Epistle to Jude, the priority of the latter is maintained.

James, the Jeremiah of the New Testament, was probably not a brother of Jesus. Forms from the Old Testament crowd out that of Jesus, the fundamental thoughts of Christ are colorlessly presented, and there is lack of vivid reference to the great events of the apostolic age. It is inconceivable that the Epistle was written before Paul, or immediately after his time. The condition of the readers, the moralizing character of the Epistle, the total transformation of the leading conceptions of the Pauline sermon, the significance of persecutions, the conception of Christianity as a law, the limitation of miraculous power to the church officers, and the relation to early Christian literature—all point to a late date, perhaps later than Domitian. It was addressed to Gentile Christians at a time when the Jewish element played no rôle whatever.

The Epistle of Jude was possibly written by a younger brother of Jesus, and was probably sent to Christians in Asia Minor.

In his comments, Soden aims to present the exact thought of the text, not to give and refute others' views. He thinks it high time to break with the opinion that a commentary, in order to be profitable, must carry with it a collection of mummies. Perhaps some readers, when tried at times by the indistinctness of the author's statements and by his passing over not a few important texts without comment, may feel that a judicious selection of "mummies" would improve the book. The notes generally presuppose a good deal of acquaintance with the principles of exegesis and knowledge of the text in hand.

George H. Gilbert

Chicago Theological Seminary.

The Book of Exodus (Expositor's Bible). By the Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D., Dean of Armagh. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1890. 8vo, pp. xx., 442, $1.25.

This volume consists of Expository Lectures on the basis of the Revised English Version of Exodus. With one unimportant exception, the order of the text is followed, paragraph by paragraph. The book is Homiletical rather than Exegetical, the evident intention of the author being to sum up the topics referred to and to indicate the practical lessons involved in them. In so doing, he makes the most of any subsequent allusions in Scripture to the events narrated here.

The plan pursued in the 442 pages is this: a section is taken, longer or shorter, and its general contents are given; then passages and persons of both ancient and modern times, that seem to the author to present parallels, whether in Scripture or out of it, are mentioned; and, finally, a number of spiritual lessons are inculcated. Some of these are extremely good; as when we are taught by the instance of Bezaleel that all gifts are divine, and that the Holy Spirit invites men to all the avocations of life. Many of the religious ideas in Exodus, notably those involved in the descriptions of the plagues, are used for an apologetic purpose.

Occasionally our author attempts minute exegetical work. In such cases he does not always give a clear notion of what his conclusion is, as, for example, in his discussion of the words which are translated "harden" (pp. 114 ff.). Sometimes his exegetical imagination is too vivid, as in his description of the passage of the Israelites across the Red Sea, when he first supplies "flying foam," of which there is no hint in the text, and thereupon constructs an argument for baptism by sprinkling (p. 212).

It is difficult to grasp the author's meaning when he uses the term "type," although one entire chapter is devoted to "The Typical Bearings of the History." He says, "One can scarcely venture to speak of the death of Herod, when Jesus was to return from Egypt, as being deliberately typified in the death of those who sought the life of Moses. But it is quite clear that the words in St. Matthew do intentionally point the reader back to this narrative" (p. 81). Elsewhere he claims that an analogy may constitute a type where there are real and deep resemblances, due to the mind of God or the character of man (pp. 4, 265, etc.).

The author's critical position is to be derived from detached remarks throughout the volume, though it was foreign to his purpose to introduce any detailed argument for his view. He seems to imply that incidental allusions in the New Testament to supposed facts of Old Testament history or chronology cannot be adduced as decisive evidence (p. 197). In two places, at least, he allows for a certain use of documents by the writer of Exodus (pp. 184, 367), but he makes no allowance for different points of view in different documents, nor for diverse authorship. Instead of this, he speaks of repetition (p. 199); and in one instance, where the description of the Tent of Meeting is with difficulty harmonized with that of the Tabernacle, he supposes a second tent pitched by Moses, who thereby "made a noble adventure of faith" (p. 435). Indeed, he seems to regard the book in its present form as a unit and written by Moses. Thus he sets before us two alternatives, Mosaic authorship or subsequent invention (p. 28), religious romance (p. 108) or post-exilian forgery (p. 374); and he claims that the suppositions of revision (p. 179), later invention (p. 238), myth, or legend (pp. 40, 84) are improbable or absurd. He asserts that the laws and narratives are natural if we hold to their Mosaic origin (pp. 201, 217). In these passing allusions, our author gives very little insight into the fundamental positions of the later critics of the Hexateuch, and says nothing about the arguments by which they have become somewhat intrenched in these positions. To refute an argument successfully, one must be able to appreciate its force.

The book breathes a devout spirit, is valuable for its practical suggestions, and so doubtless fulfils the purpose for which it was written. The scholar need not expect to find any new light thrown upon the pages of Exodus. The publishers have given an attractive appearance to the volume, and type errors are rare.

CHARLES RUFUS BROWN.
NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION,
Newton Centre, Mass.

TRUTHS TO LIVE BY. A Companion to "Every day Christian Life." By FREDERIC W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1890. Pp. xii., 372, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

One of the beauties of this volume lies in the fact that the sermons which it contains were "not written with any view to publication, but addressed from week to week to a general congregation." While avowedly "devoted almost exclusively to the exposition of doctrine," they are forcible illustrations that "practical preaching," to be really such, must have a background and substratum of dogmatic teaching. Those in the various denominations who are most vociferous in their demands for the "practical" will be found to be those who are averse to "dogma" in any form, and who can only be persuaded to take it "unsuspiciously, as children do calomel in jelly."

The author has attempted in plain and simple terms, without the technical terminology of the schools, to set forth some of the most essential Christian truths, especially as these may be drawn from the words of John and Paul. The mention of a few of the titles of the sermons will suffice for the whole—"Jesus Christ the Son of God, the Source of Life;" "Nature of Man;" "Sin;" "Divine Remedy for Sin;" "The Law Cannot Give Life;" "St. Paul's Theology," etc.

Appended to the book are three Christmas carols and an Easter carol by the author.

C. R. GILLETT.
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Abel, Ludwig, and **Winckler,** Hugo. Keilschrifttexte zum Gebrauch bei Vorlesungungen. Berlin: Spemann, 1890. Pp. iv., 100 fo., 15 mk.

Acta et decreta sacrorum conciliorum recentiorum. Collectio Lacensis. Auctoribus presbyteriis S. J. e domo B. V. M. sine labe conceptæ ad Lacum. Tom. vii. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1890. 4to, 26 mk. (Complete, 7 Bnde, 124.50 mk.)

Albers, Eman. Die Quellenberichte in Josua i.–xii. Beitrag zur Quellenkritik des Hexateuchs. Bonn: Paul, 1890. Pp. 150, 8vo, 3 mk.

Anderson, A. Marcus-Evangeliets-Opfattelse af Herrens Liv. Fremstillet i grundtraek. Kjöbenhaven: Schöneberg, 1890. Pp. 334, 8vo, 4.25 kr.

Arvine's Cyclopædia of Moral and Religious Anecdotes; with introduction by Rev. Geo. B. Cheever, D. D. New ed. New York: Funk, 1890. Pp. 895, 8vo, cloth, $3.50.

Aurand, C. Monroe. Rays of Light; or, Lectures on Great Subjects. (The Creation of Man, the Fall, the Promise of a Deliverer, the God-man, the God-man's Mediatorial Work, the Church, Divine Revelation, Sacrament of Baptism, the Sacrament of the Altar, Prayer, Salvation, Glorification.) Philadelphia: Lutheran Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. 302, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Bang, A. C. Kirkehistoriske smaastykker. Christiania, 1890. Pp. iv., 348, 8vo, 4.20 kr. (6.30 mk.).

Baraud, A. Chrétiens et Hommes célèbres au xixe siècle, 2e série. Paris: Téqui, 1890. Pp. 402, 12mo, 3 fr.

Batissol, L. La Vatican, de Paul III. à Paul V., d'après des documents nouveaux. Paris: Leroux, 1890. Pp. viii., 159, 32mo.

Beckett, W. H. English Reformation of the Sixteenth Century; with chapters on Monastic England and the Wycliffite Reformation. Illustrated by maps showing where all English Monastic institutions were situated, over what districts Lollardry spread, and where the martrys where burnt in the persecution under Mary Tudor. (Church History Series.) London: Rel. Tr. Soc., 1890. 8vo, 3s., 6d.

Bernhard, Johs., Past. Biblisch-theologische Untersuchungen. 1. Heft. Die Versuchung unseres Herrn Jesu Christi. Lübeck: Dittmer, 1890. Pp. vii., 60, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Bevan, F. Trois amis de Dieu (Jean Tauler, Nicolas de Bâle, Henri Suso). Lausanne: Mignot, 1890. Pp. 360, 8vo, 3.50 fr.

Bloch, Moses, Prof. Rabbi. Das Mosaisch-talmudische Erbrecht. Budapest (Leipzig: Fock), 1890. Pp. viii., 70, 8vo, 2 mk.

Bois, H. Essai sur les origines de la philosophie judéo-alexandrine. Paris, 1890. Pp. iii., 414, 8vo, 6 fr.

Booth, General (of the Salvation Army). In Darkest England, and the Way Out. London (and New York: Funk), 1890. Pp. 300, 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Bourazan, F. A Sacred Dictionary: An explanation of Scripture names and terms, with brief geographical and historical references. London: Nisbet, 1890. Pp. 462, 8vo, 17s., 6d.

Bradby, E. H. The Books of the Bible Dated: A handbook of a new order of the several books, according to the results of Biblical criticism; with brief notices where required on the authorship and character of each book. London: Unwin, 1890. Pp. 60, 12mo, 1s.

Brown, J., D.D. Bunyan's Home, illustrated by Allan Barraud. New York: Dutton, 1890. (No paging.) 16mo, cloth, $3.00.

Brunner, S. Lessingiasis und Nathanologie. Eine Religions-störung im 'Lessing- und Nathan-Cultus. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1890. Pp. viii., 370, 8vo, 3.60 mk.

Budde, Karl, Prof., Dr. Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau. Giessen: Ricker, 1890. Pp. viii., 276, 8vo, 7.50 mk.

Butaye, S. B A. Essai de morale universelle. Paris: 1890. Pp. xi., 302, 8vo, 3 mk.

Chapman, R. H. Where is Christ? (Companion volume to his "Religion of the Cross.") London: Sonnenschein, 1890. Pp. 312, 8vo, 4s. 6d.

Chautard, Père. Le Dahomey, par ——, des Missions africaines de Lyon. Lyons: Vitte, 1890. Pp. 35, 8vo, 1 fr.

Chidlaw, B. W., D.D. The Story of my Life: with an introductory note by Edwin W. Rice, D.D. Philadelphia: Am. S. S. Un., 1890. Pp. v., 382, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Christmas in Song, Sketch and Story. Nearly nine hundred Christmas songs, hymns and carols, with selections from Beecher, Wallace, Auerbach, Abbott, Warren, and Dickens. Selected by J. P. McCaskey. New York: Harpers, 1890. Pp. 320, 4to, $2.50.

Cornelius, C. A. Kristna Kyrkans historia. 4e. del. Kyrkans historia under senare delen af medeltiden. Stockholm: Norstedt, 1890. Pp. 344, 8vo, 3.50 kr.

Dale, R. W. The Living Christ and the Four Gospels. London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. 292, 8vo, 6s.

Deppe, Bern. Die Fest-Evangelien. Ausführliche Erklärung und Auslegung aus dem Schriften der heiligen Väter und geschätzter Homileten der Vor- und Neuzeit zusammengestellt und bearbeitet. Münster i. W.: Theissing, 1890. Pp. x., 524, 8vo, 6 mk.

Didon, Père. Jésus Christ. Paris: Plon, 1890. 2 vols. Pp. lxxxviii., 490; ii., 475, 8vo, 16 fr.

Dubois, F. Das Buch der Religionen. 10 Lieferungen. Stuttgart: Brennwald, 1889-90. Pp. xvi., 777, 8vo, 10 mk.

Dumax, V., Abbé. La Généalogie de notre-Seigneur Jésus Christ et de la très sainte Vièrge, expliquée d'apres les Pères de l'Église et les interprètes modernes. Étude d'exégèse sacrée sur le sens et les difficultés du texte, sur la chronologie qu'on peut dresser des ancêtres du Messie, sur le symbolisme de leurs noms, sur les conséquences théologiques qui se peuvent déduire des deux listes de saint Matthieu et de saint Luc. Paris: Petithenry, 1890. Pp. vi., 401, 18mo.

Eales, S. J., Rev. St Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, A.D. 1091-1153. London: S. P. C. K., 1890 (New York: Young). 16mo, 80 cts.

Eckersley, J. The Historical Character of the Old Testament; being the substance of a paper read before the Handsworth Clerical Society. London: Christ. Knowl. Soc., 1890. 12mo, 6d.

Euringer, Sebast. Der Masorahtext des Koheleth, kritisch untersucht. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1890. Pp. viii., 136, 48, 8vo, 6 mk.

Fletcher, C. R. L. Gustavus Adolphus and the Struggle of Protestantism. (Heroes of the Nations, No. 2.) New York: Putnams, 1890. Pp. xv., 316, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Friedrich, J. Das Lukasevangelium und die Apostelgeschichte, Werke desselben Verfassers. Halle, a. S.: Kaemmerer, 1890. Pp. iii., 103, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Garnier, T. P., M. A. The Title Deeds of the Church of England. London: S. P. C. K., 1890 (New York: Young). 16mo, cloth, $1.25.

Gaume, Mgr. Biographies évangéliques. Les Maîtres de la Judée (Hérode, Archelaus, Quirinius, Hérode Antipas et Hérodiade, les Hérodiens, les Pharisiens et les Saducéens). Paris: Dumoulin, 1890. Pp. 96, 18mo, 80c. (Also) Biographies évangéliques. Miracles et conversions (le Centurion de Capharnaum, l'Hémorroïsse, la Chananéenne, la Samaritaine). Paris: Dumoulin, 1890. Pp. 96, 18mo, 80c.

Gerok, Karl. Die Psalmen. In Bibelstunden. (In 3 Bdn.) 1. Bd. Stuttgart: Krabbe, 1890. Pp. viii., 459, 8vo. 3 mk.

Gietmann, Gerardus. Commentarius in Ecclesiasten et Canticum Canticorum. (Cursus scripturæ sacræ, auctoribus R. Cornely, et al.) Paris: Lethielleux, 1890. Pp. vi., 517, 8vo, 7.50 mk.

Gottschick, J. Die Kirchlichkeit der so genannten kirchlichen Theologie, geprüft. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1890. Pp. vii., 244, 8vo, 4 mk.

Grünwald, M., Rabb. Dr. Ueber den Einfluss der Psalmen auf die Entstehung der katholischen Liturgie mit steter Rücksichtnahme auf die talmudisch-midraschische Literatur. 2. Heft. Prag. (Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann), 1890. Pp. 21-36, 8vo, 1 mk.

Güdemann, M. Nächstenliebe. Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung des Matthäus-Evangeliums. Wien: Löwit, 1890. Pp. 48, 8vo, 80 pf.

Halèvy, J. Recherches bibliques. 11e fascicule. Versailles: Cerf, 1890. Pp. 467-504, 8vo.

Hall, M. H. The Builders of the Church in Northumbria. (Lives of Paulinus, Hilda, Chad, Beda, etc.) London: Masters, 1890. Pp. 112, 8vo, 2s.

Haupt, Herm. Waldenserthum und Inquisition im Südöstlichen Deutschland. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr. Pp. iv., 126, 8vo, 3.20 mk.

Heffermehl, A. V. Geistlige Möder i Norge. Et Bidrag til den norske Kirkes Historie efter Reformationen til 1814. Christiania, 1890. Pp. ii., 203, 8vo, 4.80 mk.

Hitzigrath, A. H. Die Bedeutung der Auferstehung Christi für den christlichen Glauben. Program. Hamburg: Reefe, 1889. Pp. 19, 4to.

Huemer, Johs. Gai Vetti Aquilini Juvenci evangeliorum libri IV. (Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, Vol. XXIV.) Wien: Tempsky, 1890. Pp. xlvi., 176, 8vo, 7.20 mk.

Hümmer, F. K. Des heiligen Gregor von Nazianz. des Theologen, Lehre von der Gnade. Eine dogmatisch-patristische Studie. Kempten: Kösel, 1890. Pp. viii., 143, 8vo, 2 mk.

Hurlbut, Jesse L., Rev., D.D., and **Doherty,** Robert R., Ph.D. Illustrative Notes. A guide to the study of the Sunday-school lessons for 1891. Including original and selected expositions, plans of instruction, illustrative anecdotes, practical applications, archeological notes, library references, maps, pictures, diagrams. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1890. Pp. 395, 8vo, $1.50.

Hutton, R. H. Cardinal Newman. Boston: Houghton, M. & Co., 1890. Pp. iv., 251, 12mo, $1.00.

Jahn, Alb., Dr. Πρόκλου ἐκ τῆς χαλδαϊκης φιλοσοφίας. Eclogæ e Proclo de philosophia Chaldaica sive de doctrina, oraculorum Chaldaicorum. Nunc primum ed. et commentatus est. Accedit hymnus in deum platonicus, Vulgo S. Gregorio Nazianzeno adscriptus, nunc Proclo Platonico vindicatus. Halle a. S.: Pfeffer, 1891 (1890). Pp. xii., 77, 8vo, 6 mk.

Kattenbusch, F. Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Confessionskunde. 1. Lieferung. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1890. Pp. viii., 192, 8vo, 3.60 mk.

Kawerau, Waldem. Thomas Murner und die Kirche des Mittelalters. (Schriften des Vereins für Kirchengeschichte, Nr. 30.) Halle a. S.: Niemeyer, 1890. Pp. iv., 103, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Kraus, Frz. Xav. Die christlichen Inschriften der Rheinlande. (In 2 Theilen.) Thl. I. Die christlichen Inschriften der Rheinlande von den Anfängen des christenthums am Rheine bis zur Mittel des 8. Jahrhunderts. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1890. Pp. ix., 171, 8, 4to, 30 mk.

Krebs, R., Dr. Die politische Publizistik der Jesuiten und ihrer Gegner in den letzten Jahrzehnten vor Ausbruch des 30jährigen Krieges. Halle a. S. Niemeyer, 1890. Pp. 243, 8vo, 6 mk.

Krenkel, M. Beiträge zur Aufhellung der Geschichte und der Briefe des Apostels Paulus. Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1890. Pp. vii., 468, 8vo, 9 mk.

Kropf, A. Das Volk der Xofa-Kaffern im östlichen Südafrika nach seiner Geschichte, Eigenart, Verfassung und Religion. Ein Beitrag zur afrikanischen Völkerkunde. Berlin: Berl. evang. Miss. Gesellsch., 1889. Pp. viii., 209, 8vo, 2 mk.

Lehmann, J. Die Auferstehungslehre des Athenagoras. Leipzig: Wallmann, 1890. Pp. 82, 8vo, 1 mk.

Levinsen, A. De tre förste Evangelieskrifters Aelde og Oprindelse efter indre Kjendemaerker. En Undersögelse. (Ogsaa m. T.: Vore Evangeliers Paalidelighed og Beskaffenhed I.). Kjöbenhaven: Schöneberg, 1890. Pp. 220, 8vo, 2.75 kr.

Lightfoot, Bp. Leaders in the Northern Church: Sermons preached in the Diocese of Durham. Published by the Trustees of the Lightfoot Fund. London: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. 200, 8vo, 6s.

McCartha, C. L. The Lost Tribes of Israel; or, Europe and America in History and Prophecy. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1890. Pp. 210, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Mackay, A. M. Pioneer Missionary of the Church to Uganda. By his Sister. London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. 450, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Maclaren, Alex., Rev. The Holy of Holies: Sermons on 14th, 15th and 16th chapters of the Gospel of John. New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. xii., 379, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Marcus, Ahron. Hartmann's inductive Philosophie im Chassidismus. 2. Heft. Krakau (Wien: Lippe, 1890). Pp. 146, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

Martin-Dupont, P. Essai sur l'enseignement religieux d'Isaïe. Montaubon: Granié, 1890. Pp. 62, 8vo.

Merrill, Geo. E. Crusaders and Captives. A tale of the children's crusade (thirteenth century). Boston: De Wolfe, Fiske & Co., 1890. Pp. 299, 12mo, $1.00.

Mirbt, C. Die Entstehung des Papstums. Vortrag. Leipzig: Braun, 1890. Pp. 30, 8vo, 40 pf.

Mompherrates, A. P. *Κληρονομικὸν δίκαιον τῶν κληρικῶν καὶ μοναχῶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι καὶ Τουρκίᾳ.* Athens: Beck, 1890. Pp. xv., 300, 8vo.

Morison, J. Sheaves of Ministry: Sermons and Expositions. London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. 404, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Morrison, D. The Great Hymns of the Church; their origin and authorship. London: Simpkin, 1890. Pp. 270, 8vo, 6s.

Mortet, Victor. Maurice de Sully, évêque de Paris, 1160-1196. Étude sur l'administration épiscopale pendant la seconde moitié du XIIe siècle. Paris: Daupeley, 1890. Pp. x., 210, 8vo.

Moule, Handley C. G., Rev., M. A. Life in Christ and for Christ. New York: Armstrong, 1890. Pp. iii., 132, 32mo, cloth, 40 cts.

Moule, Handley C. G., Rev., M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall. Veni Creator; thoughts on the person and work of the Holy Spirit of promise. 2d ed. N. Y.: Th. Whittaker, 1890. Pp. xv., 253, 8vo, $1.50.

Newell, E. J., Rev. St. Patrick: His Life and Teachings. (Fathers for English readers.) London: Christ. Knowl. Soc., 1890. 12mo, 2s. 6d.

Newman, John P., D.D., LL.D. Supremacy of Law. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1890. Pp. 239, 12mo, $1.00.

Ortoli, F. Les Conciles et Synodes dans leurs rapports avec le traditionnisme. Vol. V. Chartres: Durand, 1890. Pp. 144, 18mo, 3.50 fr.

Pauly, D. J. A. F. E. L. V. de. *Ορθοτονια,* sive Tractatus de græcis Novi Testamenti dialectis accentibusque cui insuper nunc demum accessit prolegomena de vera juventutis institutione. Lyon: Vitte, 1890. Pp. 55, 12mo, 5 fr.

Pentecost, G. F., D.D. Israel's Apostasy and Studies from the Gospel of St. John, covering Sunday-school Lessons for 1891. New York: Barnes, 1890. Pp. viii., 406, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Perowne, E. H., Rev. The Epistle to the Galatians; with introduction and notes (Cambridge Bible for schools and colleges). New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. xxviii., 91, 16mo, cloth, 40 cts.

Pilzecker, Alfons. Die Lehre von der sinnlichen Aufmerksamkeit. München, 1890. Pp. iii., 84, 8vo, 1.80 mk.

Preger, Wilh. Ueber die Verfassung der französischen Waldesier in der älteren Zeit. München: Franz, 1890. Pp. 73, 4to, 2.20 mk.

Ris Lambers, C. H. De Kerkhervorming op de Velume, 1523-1578. Barneveld, 1890. Pp. viii., 209, 405, 8vo, 8 mk.

Ritter, H. Dreissig Jahre protestantischer Mission in Japan. Berlin: Haack, 1890. Pp. xii., 126, 8vo, 2 mk.

Schmidt, H. Handbuch der Symbolik oder übersichtliche Darstellung der charakteristischen Lehrunterschiede in den Bekenntnissen der beiden Katholischen und der beiden reformatorischen Kirchen, nebst einem anhang über Sekten und Häresien. Berlin: Reuther, 1890. Pp. xv., 491, 8vo, 9 mk.

Schneider, C. M., Dr. Das apostolische Jahrhundert, als Grundlage der Dogmengeschichte dargestellt 2. Bd., 4. Lfg. Regensburg: Verlags-Anstalt. Pp. xii., 625-809, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Schnitzer, J. Berengar von Tours, sein Leben und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zur Abendmahlslehre des beginn. Mittelalters. München: Stahl, 1890. Pp. xvi., 415, 8vo, 6 mk.

Schwab, J., Rabbi. The Sabbath in History. St. Joseph, Mo., 1890 (1889). 2 parts. Pp. iii., 132, 133-320, 8vo, paper, $1.25.

Science et Foi, ou la Méthode scientifique comparée avec le procédé de la foi. Livre 3; Dogmes, sacrements. Paris: Drouin, 1890. Pp. 165, 12mo.

Simcox, W. H., Rev. The Revelation of St. John the Divine; with notes and introduction. (The Cambridge Bible for Schools). New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. ix., 174, 16mo, cloth, 80 cts.

Smith, Henry B., D.D., LL.D. System of Christian Theology. Edited by Wm. S. Karr, D.D. Fourth edition, revised. With an introduction by Thomas S. Hastings, D.D., LL.D. New York: Armstrong, 1890. Pp. xx., 641, 8vo, cheap ed., $2.00.

Snyder, D. Rome's voornaamste leerstellingen en bedoelingen voor den protestant toegelicht. Gorinchem, 1890. Pp. 224, 8vo, 3.75 mk.

Stein, Armin. Katharine von Bora, Dr. Martin Luther's Wife. A picture from life. Translated by E. A. Endlich. Philadelphia: Frederick, 1890. Pp. 292, 12mo, $1.00.

Steinthal, H., Prof., Dr. Zu Bibel und Religionsphilosophie. Vorträge und Abhandlungen. Berlin: Reimer, 1890. Pp. iv., 237, 8vo, 4.80 mk.

Sterrett, J. M., D.D. Studies in Hegel's Philosophy of Religion. London: Appleton, 1890. Pp. 361, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Stouff, L. Le Pouvoir temporel et le Régime municipal dans un évêché de l'empire germanique jusqu'à la Réforme (l'évêché de Bâle). Paris: Larose, 1890. Vol. II. Pp. 254, 20, 8vo.

Tait, A. High Days of the Christian Year. Teachings from the great commemorations of Christendom. London: Griffith, 1890. Pp. 412, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Todd, Elbert S., Rev., D.D. Christian Missions in the Nineteenth Century. New York: New Ch. Bd. Pub., 1890. Pp. 174, 12mo, 75 cts.

Trillon de la Bigottière, Ch. L'Héroine du Cantique des Cantiques. Paris: Soye, 1890. Pp. 51, 8vo.

Troxler, Frz., Prof. Die Päpste des 19. Jahrhunderts. Populärgeschichtliche Darstellung. Biel: Kuhn, 1890. Pp. vi., 154, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Tuck, Robert. A Handbook of Scientific and Literary Difficulties; or, Facts and Suggestions Helpful toward the Solution of Perplexing Things in Sacred Scripture; being a second series of the "Handbook of Biblical Difficulties." New York: Th. Whittaker, 1890. Pp. vi., 566, 8vo, cloth, $2.50.

Usener, Herm. Der heilige Theodosios. Schriften des Theodoros und Kyrillos. Leipzig: Teubner, 1890. Pp. xxiv., 210, 8vo, 4 mk.

Wace, H. Some Central Points of our Lord's Ministry. London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. 356, 8vo, 6s.

Werner, O. (S. J.). Orbis terrarum catholicus, sive totius ecclesiæ catholicæ et occidentis et orientis conspectus geographicus et statisticus. Ex relationibus ad sacras congregationes romanas missis et aliis notitiis observationibusque fide dignis. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1890. Pp. viii., 266, 4to, 10 mk.

Willcox, G. B., Rev., D.D. The Pastor amidst his Flock. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., 1890. Pp. 186, 12mo, $1.00.

Wimpffen, Max V. Kritische Worte über den Buddhismus. Wien: Konegen, 1890. 8vo, 1 mk.

Wolter, M. Psallite sapienter. "Psalliret weise!" Erklärung der Psalmen im Geiste des betrachteten Gebets und der Liturgie. 5. (Schluss-) Band. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1890. Pp. 515, 8vo, 5 mk. (Complete, 31 mk.)

Wright, E. J. D. Sunbeams on my Path; or, Reminiscences of Christian Work in Many Lands. London: Nisbet, 1890. Pp. 134, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Young, L. F., Rev. Studies in Bible and Church History and Doctrines; prepared for the use of Epworth Leagues; with an introduction by J. F. Marley, D.D. Cincinnati, O. Printed for the author, West. Meth. Bk. Conc., 1890. Pp. 96, 16mo, 40 cts.

Zahn, Theod., Prof., Dr. Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons. 2. Bd.: Urkunden und Belege zum 1. und 3. Bd. 1. Hälfte. Leipzig: Deichert, 1890. Pp. iv., 408, 8vo, 10.80 mk. (I. und II., 1., 34.80 mk.).

ERRATA IN LAST NUMBER.

Page 88, column 1, paragraph 2, line 4, separate "in" and "flux."

Page 88, col. 1, par. 3, line 1, for "connected" read "corrected."

Page 88, col. 2, par. 1, line 14, for "our" read "an."

Page 89, col. 1, par. 1, line 4, for "misuse" read "universe."

Page 89, col. 1, par. 2, line 1, for "observation" read "obscuration."

Page 89, col. 2, par. 1, line 13, for "consorted" read "contorted."

Page 89, col. 2, par. 1, line 21, for "classification" read "clarification."

Page 89, col. 2, par. 2, line 2, insert comma or dash after "relations."

Page 90, col. 1, par. 1, line 2, put comma *after* not *before* "likewise."

Page 90, col. 1, line 5 from bottom, for "important" read "impotent."

Page 92, col. 1, par. 2, line 5, for "expression" read "expansion."

Page 157, column 1, line 7, for "way" read "more."

NOTICES OF MAGAZINES.

WE take great pleasure in calling attention to two recent issues of Houghton, Mifflin & Co., which will make appropriate Christmas presents. The first is the edition of Lowell's charming poem, "The Vision of Sir Launfal," daintily bound and prettily illustrated with photogravures. The poem teaches a lesson of philanthropy from Christian motives, in tender and poetic language. It has had also the great honor of furnishing several of our "familiar quotations." The volume is a 16mo of 48 pages. It has a portrait of the author as he was forty-eight years ago. The other book is also a new edition of a favorite, Thomas Hughes's "Alfred the Great." The pictures are very pretty, and the book itself is well worth reading. It was originally a volume of Macmillan's *Sunday Library*.

THE CENTURY for December presents its readers with some Christmas features in the shape of a story by Joel Chandler Harris, entitled "A Conscript's Christmas," and a poem by President Henry Morton, of the Stevens' Institute, called "Christmas." The other articles are General John Bidwell's "Life in California before the Gold Discovery" (illustrated), and Guadelupe Vallejo's "Ranch and Mission Days in Alta California" (illustrated); "Franklin in Allegory," by Charles Henry Hart (illustrated); "Laurels of the American Tar in 1812," by Edgar S. Maclay (illustrated); "The Border Land of China" (Tibet), by W. Woodville Rockhill (illustrated); "Some Views on Acting," by the world-wide famous tragedian, Salvini; "The Record of Virtue: an Experiment in Moral Chemistry," by Anna Garlin Spencer; "Midwinter Storm in the Lake Region," by William Wilfred Campbell; "Can a Nation Have a Religion?" by Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott; "Ecce Signum," by Stephen Henry Thayer. The fiction embraces "The Cynical Miss Catherwaight," by Richard Harding Davis; "Colonel Carter, of Cartersville," by F. Hopkinson Smith (Part II.); "A Pair of Old Boys," by Maurice Thompson; "Sister Dolorosa," by James Lane Allen; "Marthy Virginia's Hand," by George Parsons Lathrop; "Fourteen to One," by Elizabeth Stuart Phelps. The poetry of the number embraces James Whitcomb Riley's "Some Boys;" Austin Dobson's "To a Friend across the Sea;" Celia Thaxter's "My Hollyhock;" George Parsons Lathrop's "Marthy Virginia's Hand."

LIPPINCOTT'S for December has no special Christmas article. The complete novel is by Captain Charles King, who writes a great deal, and is entitled "An Army Portia." The manner in which the public press is apt to malign army officers without sufficient investigation into the charges preferred is strikingly brought out. Mr. Joel Cook, of the Philadelphia *Ledger*, gives "A Glance at the Tariff." The first glance given by the general public at the McKinley Bill resulted in the grim determination to ruin politically every man who had voted for it, and accordingly the last election was a Waterloo for the Republican Party. Mr. H. C. Walsh writes on the Bermuda Islands, which, it seems, are gradually falling under the sway of American enterprise. W. W. Crane, in his article, "Types in Fiction," takes up the cudgel against those authors "who select some particular locality or district and take its inhabitants as specimens of a type." He objects to authors devoting their energies to portraying people not as individuals, but as samples of a certain type. "Book Talk" is contributed by Frederic M. Bird, who, under the title of "Two Houses," speaks of a couple of recent novels that have attracted considerable attention—Signor Verga's "House by the Medlar-Tree" and Thomas Janvier's "Aztec Treasure-House." Mr. Bird takes Mr. Howells to task in a clever and good-natured way for some ex-cathedra utterances in a preface to the first-named book.

Mr. Ward McAllister's "Society as I Have Found it," which was plainly written to order, and has been a financial success, is reviewed in an amusing way. There is poetry of varying excellence from that strange man, Walt Whitman, by Daniel L. Dawson, S. D. S., Jr., and Minna Irving.

HARPER'S for December is a decided departure in the way of cover for this remarkably staid magazine, for it commends and illustrates Christmas good fare. Opening the number itself, we find an article on "As You Like It," the third of the series in the comedies of Shakespeare. The comments on the play, written by Andrew Lang, are accompanied by eleven beautiful illustrations (including the frontispiece, printed in tints) from drawings by Edwin A. Abbey. Charles Dudley Warner, in an article entitled "The Winter of our Content," relates many interesting facts regarding the climatic influences of southern California. The article is accompanied by numerous illustrations from photographs and from drawings by the foremost artists. Theodore Child writes concerning "A Pre-Raphaelite Mansion"—the famous Leyland residence in London—and describes the art treasures which it contains. His article is illustrated from paintings by the distinguished English artists, Rossetti, Burne-Jones, and G. F. Watts. Pierre Loti contributes an article about "Japanese Women," which is very fully illustrated from paintings by H. Humphrey Moore. The fiction is appropriate to the holiday season. It includes "A Christmas Present," by Paul Heyse (illustrated by C. S. Reinhart); "Flute and Violin," a story of Old Kentucky, by James Lane Allen, with twenty-one illustrations by Howard Pyle; "P'laski's Tunaments," by Thomas Nelson Page (illustrated from a painting by J. W. Alexander); "Mr. Gibble Colt's Ducks," by Richard Malcolm Johnston (with an illustration by A. B. Frost); "A Speakin' Ghost," a dialect story by Annie Trumbull Slosson, and "Jim's Little Woman," by Sarah Orne Jewett. The Editorial Departments, too, have a distinctive holiday flavor. George William Curtis, discoursing upon the modern Christmas, argues that the enjoyment of true pleasure is not only a Christian privilege, but a religious duty.

THE COSMOPOLITAN for December has the following table of contents: "Away on the Mountain, Wild and Bare" (frontispiece); "The Passion Play at Oberammergau" (illustrated), by Elizabeth Bisland; "The Race" (poem), by George Edgar Montgomery; "The Cruise of the Sonoma" (illustrated), by T. H. Stevens; "Collections of Teapots" (illustrated), by Eliza Ruhamah Scidmore; "The Army of Japan," Part II. (illustrated), by Arthur Sherburne Hardy; "Hymn" (poem), by John W. Weidemeyer; "Field Marshal von Moltke" (illustrated), by James Grant Wilson; "Mrs. Pendleton's Four-in-Hand" (illustrated), by Gertrude Franklin Atherton; "Literary Boston" (illustrated), by Lilian Whiting; "Equanimity" (poem), by William Wheeler; "A Famous Fire-Place" (illustrated), by Herbert Pierson; "The Birds of Nazareth," poem (illustrated), by Elizabeth Akers; "The Pursuit of the Martyns," Part II. (illustrated), by Richard Malcolm Johnston; "Hylas" (poem), by Marion M. Miller; Review of Current Events, by Murat Halstead; "Social Problems," by Edward Everett Hale.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY for December has this table of contents: "The House of Martha," IX.–XIII., by Frank R. Stockton; "On the Translation of Faust," by William P. Andrews; "Non Sine Dolore," by R. W. Gilder; "The Wife of Mr. Secretary Pepys," by Margaret Christine Whiting; "Song," by Thomas William Parsons; "The New Departure in Parisian Art," by Birge Harrison; "Felicia," XI., XII., by Fanny N. D. Murfree; "Sir Walter Raleigh of Youghal in the County of Cork," by Louise Imogen Guiney; "The Encounter," by Helen Gray Cone; "From King's Mountain to Yorktown," by John Fiske; "Heimweh," by Sophia Kirk; "Pan the Fallen," by William Wilfred Campbell; "The United States Looking Outward," by A. T. Mahan; "Carriage Horses and Cobs," by H. C. Merwin; "But One Talent," by Oliver Wendell Holmes; "Cardinal Newman," "Ancient Athens for Modern Readers," "Two Books of Verse," "Mr. Woodberry's Criticism," "The Contributors' Club," "Books of the Month."

THE
MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 3. JANUARY, 1891. No. 4.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

SOCIALISM AND THE BIBLE.

BY REV. WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D., LL.D., COLUMBUS, O.

I HAVE been invited to discuss the teachings of the Bible with respect to Socialism. The question is indefinite. What part of the Bible—Genesis or John, the Levitical Code, or the Sermon on the Mount? The specific treatment of social questions or of moral questions is not uniform in all parts of the Bible. Actions and institutions which are commanded or allowed in one book are condemned in another. The Bible represents many centuries of moral progress; it is not to be supposed that the moral rule of the earlier stages of this progress will be identical with that of the later stages.

Nor can it be safely assumed that the *specific* teachings of the Bible, as a whole, with respect to specific acts and institutions, are binding upon the people of this generation. The last word of the Bible was written eighteen hundred years ago; since that time the world has greatly changed, largely through the influence of the Bible itself; and the maxims and usages which were current then are now obsolete. Since the last of the apostles laid down his pen an enormous progress has taken place, and the moral standards of to-day are far higher than they were when Paul was writing, under the shadow of the Colosseum, his last letter to Timothy. Now the writers of the New Testament, as well as of the Old, assume the existence of certain social institutions, and do not make open war upon them. They are not political reformers, they are the heralds and witnesses of a new spiritual dispensation. Slavery and polygamy both prevailed in Bible times, and they are assumed as existing by all the Bible writers who refer to them. There is no explicit condemnation of them. It was argued, very plausibly, by good men of the last generation that the Bible sanctions slavery—that it is a divine institution, as truly so as the family. Those who take the Bible for a book of oracles, and assume that one text is just as authoritative as another, can hardly come to any other conclusion. But those who take the Bible as a record of the progress of a people under divine guidance, and thus as a revelation of the divine will, may find some other interpretation of its reticence respecting evils of this nature. It assumes existing institutions, and shows us how they are silently modified and transformed by the working of divine principles and motives implanted in the hearts of men. These motives and principles were at work in the world from the days of Abraham to the days of John the Baptist, bringing about great social changes during that period; they have been at work no less vigorously from the days of Peter and Paul to the days of Newman and Moody, and the changes which they have wrought in these later generations are mightier far than those of the earlier period. The writers of the Bible assumed slavery and polygamy, but the principles which they taught undermined slavery and polygamy, and they have disappeared from Christendom.

The fact that we find an institution or a practice existing in Bible times, and unrebuked by Bible writers, is not, then, any warrant for its existence to-day. Perhaps the Bible itself has wrought in human society such changes that this institution or practice has been outlawed. It might have been fit and suitable for the first century—the best thing for that time; but it does not follow that it is a good thing for the nineteenth century, any more than that the garments which were fit and suitable for you when you were one year old are fit and suitable for you when you are twenty.

If, therefore, we should find either Individualism or Socialism recognized and accepted by any of the Bible writers, that fact would not guarantee its validity for the present day. It is only by a careful study of the motives and principles which appear to control that great moral movement of which the Bible is at once the record and the inspiration, that we can pronounce upon the question whether the Bible is on the side of Socialism. There is a stream of tendency which we may be able to trace—an increasing purpose which runs through the ages of the patriarchs and the prophets and down through the Christian centuries. Which way do we find that current setting—toward Individualism or Socialism ?

The existence of private property is everywhere recognized in the Bible. We are told that private property in land is a modern institution ; that the original form of ownership was communal rather than individual.

Be this as it may, the earliest of the Hebrew records indicate the private possession of land, nor do I know that there is any trace of an earlier communism. It is true that the patriarchs, whose lives form the theme of the first literature, were generally nomads ; for purposes of cultivation and permanent residence they had little need of land ; it was chiefly for burial plots that they seem to have desired a secure title. But, on their occupation of Canaan, the Israelites entered upon the agricultural stage of their history, and then the land was parcelled out among them—each tribe in a location by itself, and each family of the tribe in its own secure possession. From this time onward the principle of private property in land—with certain important limitations—was firmly established in Israel.

This does not appear to have been a lesson learned in Egypt. The tenure of land among the Egyptians was not that which the Israelites adopted at the time of the partition of Canaan. The land of Egypt was mainly held by the kings and by communities of priests, who let it out to the peasantry on terms that were none too liberal ; in later times large portions of it were divided among the soldiers as a reward for military service, by a method somewhat similar to that feudal system under which Europe was parcelled out during the middle ages. It could not have been from Egypt, therefore, that the Israelites derived their land system. It was far more popular and democratic than any model which they had ever seen. Some of the tribes were permitted to win for themselves, by conquest, rich portions of the soil still held by the original tribes, and to divide these among themselves ; but most of them received their inheritance by lot from the hand of Joshua. The impression is given in the narrative that every family of the nation received a freehold as its own peculiar possession.

From this time forward, for several generations, agriculture was, no doubt, the principal employment of the Israelites ; the laws contained in Ex. xxi.-xxiii.; which all the critics regard as the oldest portion of the Levitical legislation, rest upon the assumption that the people are all agriculturists. And not only does this ancient legislation recognize the land itself as the property of those occupying it, it also refers to the fruits of the land and the domestic animals as private property, and thus recognizes the fact that production was not under any kind of collective management.

I have alluded, however, to an important limitation to the private ownership of land among the Israelites. You know that I refer to that remarkable statute providing for a year of Jubilee, in which all the land was to return to the family to which it was originally assigned. A Hebrew family might part with its patrimony ; through sickness and misfortune it might incur debts, and be obliged to give up its land in payment ; the thrifty and the extortionate might thus succeed in accumulating large estates—like some conscienceless money-lenders and land-grabbers of these times : but at the end of every fifty years the trumpets proclaiming the year of Jubilee compelled these landed proprietors to relinquish all the estates they had thus acquired, and sent every family back to its own homestead, putting it in full possession of the ancestral acres.

Precisely when this system was introduced we are not told, nor do we know how faithfully it was adhered to ; from references in Jeremiah (xxxiv., 14) and Ezekiel (xlvi., 16, 17) it would appear that such regulations were considered binding in the days of these prophets ; it is not likely that they were observed after the Exile. But to every Jew who regarded the law as the very word of God, this solemn testimony of his statute with respect to the tenure of the land must have been a weighty word.

On economic principles it would be easy to find fault with such an arrangement : but it does not profess to be based on economic principles. It seems to recognize the fact that under the law of unrestricted competition the rich are likely to grow richer and the poor poorer ; it is a legal barrier erected in the path of this increasing inequality. It says to encroaching wealth, "Thus far and no farther !" It lifts up the victims of misfortune and poverty and sets them on their feet, and gives them another chance. In the eloquent words of Dr. Munger :

"One might add field to field for a series of years, but after a time the process ceased, and the lands went back to their original owners. The purpose was to make such a habit unprofitable, to keep the resources of society evenly distributed, to prevent the rich from becoming too rich and the poor hopelessly poor, to undo misfortune, to give those who had erred through sloth or improvidence an opportunity to improve the lessons of poverty, to prevent children from reaping the faults of their parents ; one generation might squander its portion, but the next was not forced to inherit the consequences. Thus, once in fifty years society was rehabilitated. It was a perpetual lesson in hope and encouragement. It took off accumulated burdens. It put limits about the cruelty of man to man. It was a constant assertion of equality. It fostered patriotism, a virtue that thrives best on the soil. It kept alive in every man a sense of ownership of his country."*

Other features of this legislation revealed the same spirit. Every seventh year every Hebrew slave was freed. Slavery was not forbidden, but no Hebrew could be a slave more than seven years at a time. Every seventh year was a Sabbatical year, wherein also all debts were remitted, no matter when incurred. The debtor class ceased to exist every seven years. The law interposed and released every man from his financial obligations. Probably there was not much borrowing or trusting under such laws. The creditor class was distinctly warned that its power over the debtor class would be broken on the first day of the Sabbatical year. Every man who made a loan made it with this consequence in full view. The extended credits which are so costly and often so fatal to character were impossible under such a system.

The general drift of this legislation is obvious. Certainly it does not conform to the philosophy of Individualism. It is the antithesis of *Laissez faire.* The notion that the only function of government is the police-function—that it discharges its whole duty when it keeps order in society and suffers the strong and the weak to struggle with each other for the possession of the wealth of the land, careless who secures it—is not the notion on which this legislation is based. It is paternal legislation, indeed, of a very stringent sort. It assumes that some are weaker than others, and that one of the functions of the State is to keep the strong from oppressing the weak. As Dr. Munger says, "It was a continual rebuke to the hardness of avarice ; it assured the poor and unfortunate that by a divine law his burden would be taken off."

And yet this system is not properly described as Socialism. It recognizes not only private property, but private enterprise ; it leaves plenty of room for individual initiative ; it allows men to suffer, though not hopelessly, the consequences of their own idleness and improvidence ; it keeps the responsibilities of life resting pretty heavily on the shoulders of the individual. Perhaps we may say that this legislation is a manifest attempt to secure the advantages of private ownership and private enterprise and at the same time to guard against their abuses. The point to be noted is, however, that it regards such abuses as inseparable from private ownership and private enterprise ; and that it enlists the power of the State for their correction. In this respect it may be said to be socialistic. It does not regard natural law as adequate for the equitable solution of social questions, but assumes that the State must interpose for the removal of the inequalities and the redress of the injuries which are seen to result from the unrestricted competition of the weak with the strong.

After some generations of this quiet agricultural life, the people of Israel, like the people of the United States, advanced to a commercial period. The Canaanites had been the traders ; but Israel began to tread, cautiously at first, in the path which her people have since followed so diligently. "The towns," says Wellhausen, "grew more influential than the country ; money notably increased, and the zeal of piety was quite unable to arrest the progress of the change which set in. . . . The extortions of the corn market, the formation of large estates, the frequency of mortgages—all show that the small peasant proprietorship was unable to hold its own against the accumulations of wealth. The wage-receiving class increased, and cases in which free Hebrews sold themselves into slavery were not rare."* This would indicate that the Jubilee legislation had become a dead letter. But the prophets, who at this later day represent the divine government, never cease to protest against these inequalities and oppressions.

"Woe unto them," cries Isaiah, "that

---

* "The Freedom of Faith," p. 184.

* Encyclopædia Britannica, XIII., 408.

join house to house, and lay field to field, till there be no room, and ye be made to dwell alone in the midst of the land. In mine ears saith the Lord of hosts, of a truth many houses shall be desolate, even great and fair, without inhabitant."

"Woe unto him," saith Jeremiah, "that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by injustice; that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not his hire; that saith, I will build me a wide house and spacious chambers, and cutteth him out windows; and it is ceiled with cedar, and painted with vermilion. Shalt thou reign, because thou strivest to excel in cedar? did not thy father eat and drink, and do judgment and justice? Then it was well. Was not this to know me? saith the Lord. But thine eyes and thine heart are not but for thy covetousness, and for to shed innocent blood, and for oppression, and for violence, to do it."

"Woe unto them," thunders Micah, "that devise iniquity and work evil upon their beds! when the morning is light, they practise it, because it is in the power of their hands. And they covet fields, and seize them; and houses, and take them away; and they oppress a man and his house, even a man and his heritage."

Such was the clear and constant witness of the prophets against the "mercantilism" of their day—the heartless greed unchecked by law which, in the words of Habakkuk, built towns with blood and established cities by iniquity. For doubtless all the practices which drew from heaven these thunderous "woes" were perfectly legal, and in strict accordance with the doctrines of individualistic economy. These men had gotten possession of the fields and the houses of their neighbors by obedience to the natural laws of trade; by buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest; by mortgages and bills of sale executed in regular form. The natural laws of trade were having free course and being glorified after their own fashion. This was the burden of the prophet's denunciation. Once there was a divine law which interposed for the prevention of such oppression; that law has lost its force, but the prophet, who speaks the divine message, lifts up his voice to rebuke the iniquity and to threaten the land with overthrow if it be not repented of and forsaken. The humane spirit of the earlier legislation finds constant expression in the preaching of the prophets.

We may safely say, then, that while the Old Testament nowhere inculcates the socialistic theories, its legislation and its teaching manifest certain socialistic tendencies. Rodbertus and Bellamy would find their fundamental ideas set at naught in these laws and prophecies, but they could derive, I think, rather more comfort from them, after all, than Ricardo or Malthus could ever have done.

But Israel, enervated by luxury and weakened by ill-gotten wealth, at length fell a prey to the stronger nations round about; its people were scattered, its national power was broken. Then, in the midst of its deepest degradation, came forth that Prince and Saviour in whom its life was renewed, and by whom the promise of its triumph shall be fulfilled. Law and prophecy and ritual find their realization in the Christ of Nazareth, to whom alone these great words of Isaiah can be applied, "Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it with judgment and with righteousness from henceforth even forever."

What now saith this Lawgiver concerning the powers and duties of government? Was Jesus, the Christ, a Socialist? Is Christianity Socialism?

Count Leo Tolstoi says that He was an Anarchist—of that peaceful and non-resistant type to which the erratic Russian nobleman himself belongs. He declares that the command of our Lord, "Resist not evil," forbids the support of all governments maintained by force; forbids the arrest and imprisonment of evil-doers; forbids the collection of taxes by legal process; takes away, in fact, the very foundations of government as at present administered. Count Tolstoi teaches that if we were consistent Christians we should not only disband our armies, but dismiss our police, discharge our judges and sheriffs, and turn our court houses into art galleries and our jails into hospitals. Count Tolstoi labors with the Sermon on the Mount to show that this must be the precise meaning of our Lord, and succeeds, to his own satisfaction. It is not a difficult thing to do, if you adopt his method of interpretation, which is, it must be confessed, the orthodox method. If Christ's words are to be taken literally; if no allowance be made for metaphor and hyperbole, then this doctrine and a great many other ridiculous doctrines can be easily deduced from them. I do not suppose, however, that many intelligent persons are ready to accept Count Tolstoi's interpretation of Christ's words. Jesus certainly told his disciples to support existing governments; and the governments existing were maintained by force.

Jesus was not an Anarchist, even of Count Tolstoi's non-resistant type. Was he, then, a Socialist? If the one word described him, the other could not; for the Anarchist and the Socialist are political antipodes. The one would abolish government; the other would extend the range and power of government until it should cover nearly the whole of life. The Socialist desires that the government shall own and manage all the farms, all the mines, all the railroads, all the factories, all the stores and shops; that it shall own and lease all the dwelling-houses; that it shall employ and direct all the teachers, physicians, artists, musicians, journalists; that all the people shall belong to the civil service and do their work under the direction of government, receiving from the government their stipend, which they may exchange in the government warehouses for the goods there stored. This enormous extension of the functions of the government is what is meant by Socialism. It signifies the nationalization of land and capital and industry—of the machinery of production and transportation and distribution. Socialism would have the government the only capitalist, the only manufacturer, the only merchant, the only employer, the only landlord; the people would all be laborers, mechanics, clerks, overseers, employés of one grade or another in the service of the government.

Such being the nature of Socialism, it is, of course, absurd to say that Jesus Christ was in any proper sense of the word a Socialist. Whatever visions of the future he may have entertained, it would have been impossible for the people who lived at that day to conceive of such an organization of industry as that which Socialism now proposes. The economic conditions on which Socialism rests were not then existing—the division of labor, the machinery, the facilities of communication which render its programme conceivable, if not practicable, at the present day were then far in the future. Jesus Christ commanded his disciples to respect existing governments, but there is no word of his which hints at any such extension of the functions of government as the Socialists now demand.

That he was a Communist could be more plausibly maintained. Communism is the organization of the local community with common property for co-operative purposes. We have several communes now in full operation in this country; the whole nation might thus resolve itself into communistic groups with very little change in our laws. The Shakers and the Zoarites are Communists, and it might be argued that some such fraternal organization as theirs would be in accordance with the precepts of Christ and with the spirit of his teachings. It is also true that the first Christian church at Jerusalem adopted, to some extent, communistic methods. "And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and they sold their possessions and goods and parted them to all as every man had need." Precisely to what extent this principle of the community of goods was carried it is difficult to say. It is possible that the words just quoted signify only that while they dwelt together in a common household, the transfer of property to the community was voluntary and only partial; that those who wished to do so retained in their own possession portions of their property; that it was only as the need arose that they disposed of houses and lands and brought the proceeds to augment the charity fund in the hands of the apostles. Such seems to be the implication of Peter's words to Ananias (Acts v. 4).

Even, however, if it be admitted that the Church at Jerusalem made the experiment of Communism, these facts must be borne in mind:

1. There is no recorded word of the Lord himself requiring or suggesting this manner of life.

2. This experiment was, on the economic side, a palpable failure. The Church at Jerusalem was reduced to the depths of poverty, and contributions had to be taken by Paul and his associates in Europe for the relief of the poor Christians at Jerusalem.

3. We have no record of any other attempts to organize churches upon a communistic basis. Many other churches were formed by the apostles in Asia and in Europe; but the members of these churches continued to live in separate households, to hold private property, and to carry on business in the old way. There are frequent references in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles to the social life of the early Christians, and there is no indication that they regarded the manner of life of the Church at Jerusalem as a model for them.

What we are entitled to say about the commune at Jerusalem is only this: that the spirit which found expression in it was the very spirit of Christ, but that the method was not adapted to that day and age, and was, therefore, a failure. The spirit has never departed from the Christian church; the method has been sometimes employed, as in the monastic communities, but has not yet commended itself to the enlightened judgment of Christians as the best method for the organization of social life. All attempts at co-operative industry or co-operative housekeeping are, however, approximations to this communistic plan, and the time may come when it will be adopted far more widely than it is to-day. So M. Renan prophesies:

"When modern individualism has borne its last fruits; when humanity, dwarfed, dismal, impuissant, shall return to great institutions and their strong discipline; when our shop-keeping society, say, rather, when our world of pygmies shall have been driven out with scourges by the heroic and idealistic portion of humanity, then life in common will be prized again as much as ever. A number of great things, such as science, will organize themselves in a monastic form. . . . The splendid ideal traced by the author of the Acts shall be inscribed as a prophetic revelation over the entrance of the paradise of humanity, 'All that believed were together and had all things common.'"*

That Christianity is developing the co-operative man, and is thus preparing the way for such voluntary co-operation as M. Renan predicts, may be hopefully asserted. But this is a very different thing from that complete subjection of the individual to the State which is the essence of Socialism.

Nevertheless, we often hear it said that Christ was the first Socialist; that Christianity is essential Socialism. "Every Christian," says Émile de Laveleye, "who understands and earnestly accepts the teaching of his Master is at heart a Socialist, and every Socialist, whatever may be his hatred against all religion, bears within himself an unconscious Christianity. . . . It is impossible to understand by what strange blindness Socialists adopt Darwinian theories, which condemn their claims of equality, while at the same time they reject Christianity, whence these claims have issued, and where their justification may be found. At all events, we may conclude that the religion which has shaped us all, advocates as well as adversaries, has formulated in the clearest terms the principles of Socialism, and that it is precisely in Christian countries that socialistic doctrines have taken deepest root."†

These words lack precision, but they convey a partial truth. To say that Christianity "has formulated in the clearest terms the principles of Socialism" is wide of the mark, but it is true that Christianity embodies the spirit and purpose which Socialism seeks to realize. Let us note the particulars in which the Christianity of the New Testament and the Socialism of to-day are in substantial accord:

1. They are agreed in the desire to befriend the poor, to relieve the oppressed, to protect the weak against the craft of the strong. They unite in repudiating that heartless philosophy which has prevailed so long, whose maxim is, "Every man for himself." Instead of giving liberty to the strong, that they may oppress the weak, they teach that it is the duty of the strong to help the weak. This is one of the first principles of Christianity, and it is, I believe, one of the leading motives of those who are advocating Socialism.

2. They unite in condemning the degree of inequality which now exists in society, and in wishing to bring about a more equitable distribution of the national wealth.

3. They agree in believing that the existing oppressions and inequalities can be greatly lessened and mitigated by the application to them of intelligence and conscience. They do not regard them as the result of inexorable law, but as evils removable by wise human effort.

4. They go together for a little way in their demand that the State interpose for the removal of such inequalities, but it is here that they part company, modern Socialism pushing this demand much further than Christianity is yet inclined to do.

"Christianity," says Laveleye, "condemns riches and inequality with all the vehemence of Socialism; but it is not to the State that it looks for the establishment of the reign of justice." Not to the State alone, certainly; but why not to the State in part? Christianity inspires men with the spirit of co-operation; it teaches them how to co-operate; is there any reason why they should not co operate, through political organization, for the restraint of extortion, for the promotion of equity? That is certainly a very large part of their high calling as the disciples of Christ. More than this, there are certain industries which are almost necessarily monopolies. It is through these, when they are in the hands of private persons, that many of the heaviest burdens are imposed upon the weak. It is in the power of those who hold these monopolies to tax the rest of the community for their own enrichment. Many great fortunes have been accumulated in this way. Now the

---

* Quoted by J. Llewellyn Davies, in "Social Questions," p. 216.

† "The Socialism of To-Day," p. xix.

Christian law requires those who hold the power of the State (in a republic the people) to restrain and prevent such abuses. The sovereign power must not, by law, authorize some of the people to enrich themselves at the expense of the rest. The sovereign power must not stand idly by and see such wrongs perpetrated ; it must take hold of them and right them. And there are also various methods in which the sovereign people, thus co-operating in political organizations, can promote the common welfare.

This is the principle of Socialism. We all go part way with the Socialists. We all believe in the Post Office and the Public School ; to this extent we are Socialists. Those of us who are Christians find in the new commandment of our Lord the foundation of such institutions ; they are illustrations of the law which binds us to work together for the common good. Why do we not go to the full length of the Socialists in this path ? Why do we hesitate to commit to the State the entire control of land and capital, the entire organization and direction of industry and trade ? We do co-operate in some industries ; why not in all ? Is it because we find in either Testament any specific prohibition of Socialism ? No ; I find none. Is it, then, solely because we believe that such co-operation is not practicable, from an economic point of view ? Doubtless we may have our doubts on this score ; but they are not decisive. The main reason why, as Christians, we hesitate, is our fear that in such a regimen as Socialism proposes character would be weakened, if not destroyed. Socialism greatly reduces if it does not cancel responsibility. It guarantees to all men a livelihood, no matter how idle and thriftless they may be. It solves for every man the problem of life, and protects him against the consequences of his own recklessness and folly. I do not think that character can be developed in any such school as this ; I should expect to see the type of manhood steadily dwindling under the Socialistic regime.

Another phase of the same fact is described when we say that Socialism must greatly limit freedom. The expounders of its philosophy always argue against this conclusion, but it cannot be evaded. With any kind of human nature which we are likely to see on this planet within the next millennium, no socialistic machinery could be worked at all without the most vigilant surveillance, the most rigid despotism. Very little liberty would be left to anybody ; we should all be put into the mill together and compelled to tread a narrow and monotonous round.

It is precisely here that I find the fatal defect of Socialism ; and it is precisely here that its conflict with the religion of the Bible is most clearly seen.

The Bible asserts and defends the freedom of every man ; it suffers no invasion of his personality ; it clears wide spaces all about him, and cries aloud to tyrants, hierarchs, demagogues, " Stand aside ! give this man room to work out his own salvation !"

It puts the responsibilities of living upon him also, and compels him to bear them. " Every man shall give account for himself unto God." " If thou be wise, thou shalt be wise for thyself ; but if thou scornest, thou alone shalt bear it." While it seeks to surround every man with all the aids of infinite grace, while it makes it certain that no man who will lay hold on the hopes and helps set before him will ever be lost, it summons him to choose every day, life or death, blessing or cursing, and commits his destiny to his own volition. This is the only school in which virtue can be developed, and virtue is the one concern of Christianity. It is here that Socialism breaks down. It cares for comfort more than for character ; it proposes to sacrifice in the attainment of comfort the conditions under which character is gained. In this it is directly in conflict with the deepest principles of Christianity.

Moreover, it is essentially materialistic in its methods. Its main reliance is upon an improved environment. It expects to reform men by reforming their circumstances. Christianity, on the other hand, puts its main reliance upon the spiritual forces by which men are changed, and looks to see the circumstances changed as the result of this inward renewal Something can be done by both these methods ; neither can be neglected ; the only question is, which is the more radical ; which shall be emphasized ? Christianity puts the emphasis on the spiritual forces, and the answer of Christianity thus reveals a profounder philosophy and a deeper insight into the facts of life.

Nevertheless, we must not forget that it is with the method of Socialism, and not with its spirit or its purpose, that Christianity is at variance. The end which Socialism has in view is precisely the end at which Christianity has always been aiming. The wrongs which Socialism seeks to right are the wrongs against which the Hebrew prophets thundered, and Christ and his apostles lifted up their voices. And although the philosophy of Socialism is defective, in its failure to cherish the values of character, it is nearer to Christianity, even in its extremest forms, than the soulless Individualism which has given the law to our political and economic science for the last hundred years. The great forerunners of our modern Socialism—Thomas More, the Italian Campanella, Francis Bacon—were they not all Christians, and did they not derive the very impulse to their work from Christ and his Gospel? To the great motive that moved them, wherever we find it active in human hearts, let us never fail to do full justice. And let us trust that, as we ponder those great themes, studying with open mind and sympathetic heart the problems of poverty, we may find the safe path through freedom and virtue into the thousand years of peace.

THE TRIALS OF YOUTH.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR MARCUS DODS, D.D.

From *The British Weekly* (Nonconformist), London, October 23, 1890.

"It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth." To bear the yoke is to be in subjection: to be compelled to walk in certain lines at the will of another, to be prevented from choosing for ourselves and being our own masters. The compulsion which is most commonly felt in youth is the compulsion of circumstances. Without being in absolute poverty, the majority of young men find that they have no choice, but must at once try to earn a livelihood. And the limitations thus prescribed by circumstances are often very serious, and press very heavily on the mind of the aspiring youth; he is compelled to take what offers in the way of work, and to forego such occupations as he might have preferred; his education must be curtailed, however much he may long for the training a University curriculum gives; he has in many cases to postpone marriage, and finds that the neediness of relatives makes it impossible for him to lay up even the small sum which might eventually enable him somewhat to spread his wings. In fact, many young men find themselves born into most unfavorable circumstances so far as their prospects in life go, and they can see nothing before them but years of unremitting and uncongenial toil.

Still, if there is a spark of real manhood, a leaven of generosity in the spirit, it will be found good to bear this yoke. To throw a boy into the water is a rough-and-ready lesson in the art of swimming, but with a boy of spirit it is likely to be successful. The training which straitened circumstances give is one which no money can purchase. It is true enough that many rich men's sons do well and work as hard as if they were entirely dependent on their own exertions. There are natures which do not need the spur of poverty, but have in themselves eagerness and incentive enough. It is also true that the advantages of education which wealth affords are not to be despised. But advantages of a different, if not of a superior kind, are present in circumstances where restriction and compulsion are always felt. A lad is put upon his mettle, and if there is grit in him at all, it will appear. He is conscious that it depends entirely on himself whether he is to succeed or to fail. He feels himself face to face with the world, and is compelled to use all his faculties and powers to save himself from defeat. The habits of industry, the love of work, the delight in mastering difficulties, the ability to put pressure on himself, and the independence of character which a lad thus acquires, pass into his nature as its permanent and most valuable ingredients. His income may be smaller than that of many of his contemporaries, but the man is ultimately of much more account than the income, and no circumstances have produced better men than those in which there was considerable hardship at first.

It must also be considered that the privations which press so heavily on some families, and which in some unhappy instances benumb affection, do in the main afford opportunities for self-sacrifice and considerateness and concern for the common good which bind families together, and give a richness and beauty to the family life which you might have sought in vain had circumstances been easy and calling for no sacrifice.

Do not, then, quarrel with your circumstances. You may quite legitimately wish to change them, but hold firmly to the belief that there is no condition in life in which you may not fulfil God's will and do what needs to be done. Impatience, self-will, self-confidence, the pride of life, thirst for pleasure, romantic ideas, vanity, all that appears in youth as the froth of its life and energy, is better removed by the chastening, sobering, chilling touch of privation than by a thousand sermons.

But in other senses it is good that a man bear the yoke in his youth. He must put himself under control and discipline if he is to get the full benefit of his youth. All this control and discipline is intended to fit him for liberty afterward, as all drill and gymnastics are meant to give the body freedom of movement, and to give a man the perfect use of all his powers. And all the while a boy is at school and under parental or other control, his natural instinct craves for the time when he shall be his own master. "His own master"—note the expression, for much of the secret of happiness and of liberty lies in it. The rock on which thousands of young lives are wrecked is a false and impracticable idea of liberty. To be free from control, to be our own master, that is the craving that haunts every one at the entrance of life. How is it to be achieved? Certainly not by flying in the face of the profoundest moral laws; every law you break becomes your tyrant, to arrest and punish you. There is no outlook through sin; that way freedom does not lie, but bondage. You cannot alter the laws of your own moral constitution, nor can you alter the laws of the world in which you are; you can never become your own master by endeavoring to live as if these laws were not. These laws are, and rule every human life, and to run counter to them is to make it a certainty that you shall never be a freeman.

We must then learn to correct the natural but erroneous impression we have, that doing whatever the lower parts of our nature prompt us to do is to have liberty and to be our own master. To allow passions, cravings, propensities, to rule us and govern and determine our conduct is to become the worst of slaves. External authority or tyranny a man may resist or escape from, but when his own passions are his tyrant he becomes the most abject and hopeless of slaves. You see it in a thousand instances. The lad who but a year ago allowed himself to be led by his lower nature, and made experiment of some form of profligacy under the impression he was asserting his liberty and commencing to do as he pleased, has already found that he has become a slave to the passions he has indulged, and that they compel him to do their bidding, though he knows he is ruining his prospects in life, risking his health, sacrificing his character, distressing his best friends. There is absolutely no path to liberty through wrongdoing. The road is barred that way. We are merely duped by our passions if we suppose that we are our own masters when we yield ourselves to do the bidding of our lusts.

Freedom comes through discipline; through absorbing into our own will the laws which govern our life; to be our own master is to exercise self-control, and allow that in us to rule which was intended to be supreme. When we submit ourselves to the rule of conscience and come into harmony with God's laws, approving them in our heart, then only are we free. We have then nothing against us, nothing outwardly constraining us—our own will moves us in the same direction as God's law and will. You are not your own master while you obey the lowest things in you; you are your own master when you can make yourself do what you judge to be right—when that which you call yourself and which is the core of your being rules all the rest that is in you. You yourself are something nobler and better than any of your members or any faculty in you; these are your organs and instruments whereby you work on the world around you, but you yourself are different from these, and are called to rule all these. Thus only is it possible to become your own master.

To carry this out in detail may be said to constitute the whole training and trial of youth. He who emerges into manhood with self-control, approving heartily and choosing with his whole soul what is right, and able to make his lower nature do his bidding, may be said to have overcome. He who enters manhood a slave to any evil habit, with no strong self-control, weak, flabby, unreliable, a dead weight that adds to the world's bias to ruin—he may be said to have missed the main use of his early years. Like all blessings, our youth looks largest when we have lost it. While we have it we think it the time for disporting ourselves before we settle to the earnest and work of life; when we look back on it we see it was the only time we have for giving a tone to all that follows.

Coming to detail, then, we must exercise self-control in respect of all unworthy pleasures. The youth of a certain kind and brought up in certain companies thinks he is scarcely a man till he has tasted pleasures which he knows to be forbidden. The very fact that they are forbidden makes them objects of desire. He cannot reconcile himself to the thought that others are enjoying what he has not tasted; that they have experiences he has not. There can be no question that to most dispositions "stolen waters are sweet." In wild lawlessness there is a charm which pleasantly contrasts with the monotony of business and the humdrum of daily life. New powers and capacities are called out. The paths of dissipation are new ground, and invite with all the charm of novelty. There are chances of adventure, of seeing new phases of life, inducements of various kinds which in point of fact do prevail with a very large proportion of young men. And these inducements present themselves not once or twice, but continually; and if in one mood they have little power with us, in another they may prevail.

The true corrective of this bias toward unworthy pleasures is to be found in filling our life with worthy pursuits. Of course knowledge also helps. When one has seen a little more of life, the pleasures which attract the mass of young men seem so very childish, so false, and tawdry, so positively repulsive in many respects, that one wonders where the charm is. The company in which paint and padding count for beauty, and coarseness or profanity for wit, is not the company any man of discernment or cultivated mind could find himself comfortable in. The degradation on the part of the performers to which many popular entertainments lead, would touch any manly heart and make it painful to be a party to such degradation. In the cloak-room of many a place of entertainment you must with your coat leave your self-respect and all respect for humanity, and necessarily come out a poorer man, with less fitness for life.

But even when the pleasures that attract are recognized to be such as no men of any real stature and dignity could possibly stoop to, our self-control needs some other aid than that of knowledge. It is good to say to ourselves, these scenes I am asked to join are degrading and delusive. Instead of proving my manhood by entering them, I show distinctly that my manhood is poor and weak, easily deceived, easily led, ignorant and undeveloped. It is good to cherish and strengthen our self-control thus, and by reading such healthy writers as Thackeray, whose scorn of all that is base and foolish and filthy and profane communicates itself to the reader and makes that seem contemptible which is contemptible, and that be repulsive to us which in itself is repulsive.

But the true safeguard is to fill the heart and life with higher things, to commit ourselves cordially to the Christian life, recognizing its attractiveness and finding in it enough and more than enough to interest, to stimulate, to satisfy. There is no salvation but in Christ. Only in fellowship with Him does our self-control receive adequate support. He has views of life, plans, present work in the world, which if we enter into we shall find ourselves lifted to the right level of human life and trained to all that is best in human nature. It is in Christ's service you find true life and true freedom and true manhood.

Another detail in which self-control must be exercised is in the books we read. During the last few years our literature has undergone a most undesirable change. Books which twenty or even ten years ago would have been kept under lock and key, and would certainly have been on sale nowhere outside Holywell Street, are now obtruded upon us on almost every bookseller's counter. French novels, whose main attraction is their indecency, are translated and sold in thousands—a symptom of degenerate taste and of that pruriency which marks an unwholesome and undersized nature. Even a more alarming symptom of our degeneracy is that so many of our own novelists adopt so much of the French views of life as may be supposed to attract English readers, so that now you will see in Christian families, and read by all the members of the household, stories the plot of which is offensive to decency. Yet so subtle and insidious is this moral taint that attaches to a large part of our literature, that many readers are unconscious of its presence, not because to the pure all things are pure, but because they who have for a while breathed a bad atmosphere are insensible to its offensiveness. Happily, English literature is rich enough to make it quite unnecessary for us to open one suspected volume. Form your taste on Scott and Thackeray, Carlyle and Emerson, and you will have no relish for unclean and corrupting literature. Here again, if you feel you are losing something by not reading what others read, exercise self-control, and remember that what you lose is well lost, a tainted mind, a lowered tone, a polluted imagination, while you gain self-respect, manliness, and purity.

But again, those who have too much self-respect to find any attraction in such undesirable knowledge, sometimes show a similar craving, but in a higher and purer sphere. It is not uncommon to meet with persons who have a silly ambition to be recognized as having passed through a severe struggle with doubt and spiritual perplexity. To have never trespassed beyond the pale of orthodox belief is in some circles counted tame. If we believe what our fathers believed, we seem to stand convicted of dulness of perception, of a slow conservatism that must fall a victim to the malaria of its own stagnation. We feel a desire to experience the doubts of which we hear other men speak; we feel as if it were discreditable to our understanding not to have passed through this mental phase.

Now there are two kinds of doubt which are very different in their origin and character, and which must be treated differently. There is the doubt which is almost invariably begotton in a strong and independent mind when that mind first applies itself to the solution of the mysteries of nature, of life, and of God. There is also the doubt which is assumed, like any other manner or habit which finds favour in society; sometimes there is an affectation of weariness and ennui, sometimes of indifference, and so in some circles there is an affectation of doubt. It is "the thing" to talk disparagingly of traditional belief, and to assume a sceptical attitude toward miracles and other objects of faith. The fictitious or imitative doubter may always be distinguished from the true doubter by his frivolous and ignorant manner of meeting proposed solutions of his doubts. He who merely apes doubt and seems to consider it a desirable mental condition, shrinks from conviction and seeks to perpetuate his uncertainty. To such as fancy that sceptical difficulties are symptoms of enlightenment, may be commended the words of the great philosopher who may be said to have consecrated doubt. After describing how he stripped himself one by one of all beliefs, he goes on to say: "For all that, I did not imitate the sceptics who doubt for doubting's sake, and pretend to be always undecided; on the contrary, my whole intention was to arrive at certainty, and to dig away the drift and sand until I arrived at the rock beneath" (Descartes in Huxley, 122).

This is the attitude of the true doubter. He doubts that he may arrive at the truth. He questions all his beliefs that he may be sure he holds no error. He has no desire or purpose to remain in doubt, but from his very anxiety to be sure of the truth questions and tests all he has been taught. For such doubt one can have nothing but sympathy; and where there is no vainglorious and ignorant bluster about our advanced age, but a reverential remembrance of the attainments of the past, a modest and honest scepticism regarding much that was believed in the past may not only be pardoned, but commended. For indeed our beliefs must in many respects be altered, and while we find no fault with those who accept all they have been taught, neither do we find fault with those who see that for them this is impossible. It is not through the understanding so much as through the conscience and the heart that a man becomes a Christian. And so long as any one is loyal to Christ because he is conscious that in Him he is brought into harmony with God, and because he desires to live in fellowship with Christ and to serve Him, it is not essential that he should believe all that he has been taught. There is room in the Church of Christ for questioning spirits as for docile and credulous spirits; and as there is work for the one class, so is there work for the other. What is wanted much more than acceptance of traditional belief is tolerance, based on the clear perception that many articles of our creed are not certain, and that thoughtful men cannot but have different opinions regarding their truth.

While urging self-control in these various particulars, I am more keenly sensible than any of you how idle it is to *speak*, to attempt to tame strong and wild passions by good advice, to lead leviathan by a nosehook; to preserve you from pain and the haunting misery of a mistaken and wasted life by telling you of dangers you cannot believe in. I know that though I could read your future in your present as it is certainly contained in your present, and though I could accurately and vividly describe it, that would not keep you from following your bent. It takes ever so little to make shipwreck of a life; one point of the compass makes all the difference between success and destruction. The spring of safety and happiness lies deeper than man can go. Christ spoke an absolute truth when He said, "Without Me ye can do nothing." Without Him we can see some of our sins and fight against them, and if they be sins that threaten our social position or our reputation we can avoid and overcome them; but sins which are hidden from men or little thought of by them, sins which lurk in the heart and make us worldly and ungodly and sensual, these gather strength in spite of all we can do, unless we have the aid of Christ's fellowship.

I believe it is this which explains the melancholy fact that so many well-intentioned, and in a sense Christian people, fall into serious sin. I believe it is this which explains why sins which *are* fought against and which form the staple of a man's warfare against sin, go on acquiring strength until they burst upon him with an accumulation of misery and ruin which he little thought of when he thoughtlessly and almost innocently let the habit form. Until we fight against sin as the allies and subjects of Christ, as well as for our own sake, we seem to fight not in Christ's strength, but in our own. And if we think of our sin as mainly our affair, if we hate it mainly for the shame it brings upon us, then when we are tempted by it and when our own view of it is changed, the advantage and pleasure of it being now clear and the shame of it remote and dimly seen, there is absolutely nothing to restrain us from it. But if we habitually live with Christ and consider His will in all things, and that our sin brings grief to Him, when we are tempted, though our own view of sin is altered, we are conscious that His view of it remains the same, and in sympathy with His judgment we also condemn it.

I suppose every one of you is conscious of some sin, of something that lowers you in your own eyes, and that sometimes makes you fear it is stronger than you are, and may carry you into a future of the darkest and saddest kind. There is, may I not say, something in the character or life of each of you which must be removed ere you can be all you ought to be. If so, what business more urgently calls you, or when accomplished will give you a truer satisfaction and set your feet free for future attainment and enjoyment, than to clear away this recognized and growing evil? Could you have any truer joy this day than to be able to say that the thing which most troubled and threatened you has been removed? Why should you not have this happiness, say, in a year hence? Deal seriously with these serious things—look forward to what awaits you in life. Be perfectly sure that through sin lies no path to happiness, that every step you take on that road must be retraced with the shaming conviction that you have been a fool. Each part of life has its own duties and its own opportunities, and at no future period can you come back into the past and make up for bygone omissions. The future periods have their own tasks, and are so filled with what is proper to them that what has been left undone in a former period cannot now be attended to. You are permanently crippled for life in that omitted particular. It is in life as in a college curriculum: things are arranged in a progressive order, the first steps fitting for those which succeed. If a student idle through his mathematical year he finds himself unable to face the higher studies for which mathematics are necessary. And if he tries to go back upon his course and repair his neglect, then his strength is wasted and his attention diverted from the studies which now demand his entire energy. So it is in life. Every evil habit you suffer to find place in you lowers your energy throughout life, weights and burdens you, and holds you back from what you aspire to. The sin you admit into your life is not like a stone in a horse's hoof, that cripples for a few steps but can easily be knocked out and leave no trace: it is a morbid growth, it is in your blood, it taints your whole system, and is a weakness to the end. Turn then from all that is low, and defiling, and secretive, and ungenerous, turn from what is ungodly—be sure you are gladly living under the great law of human life, dependence on Jesus Christ, and with Him there will enter your life "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honorable, . . . just, . . . pure, . . . lovely, . . . of good report."

EDITORIALS ON THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN'S CASE IN THE REPRESENTATIVE LONDON CHURCH OF ENGLAND NEWSPAPERS.

From *The Church Times* (High Church), November 28, 1890.

I.

THE ARCHBISHOP'S OLIVE BRANCH.

MUCH as we have disliked the course which the Archbishop of Canterbury has felt it his duty to take in regard to the charges made against the Bishop of Lincoln, and strenuously as we have protested against the popish principles upon which his claims to spiritual jurisdiction as sole judge in the case rest, we freely and frankly admit that the careful and learned argument of his Grace has taken us by surprise as being apparently a most important step toward the removal of what seemed the almost hopeless deadlock in the relations between Church and State, and toward the peaceful solution of the disputes about the Ritual of the English Church.

We do not like to appear to receive ungraciously a Judgment which is in all essential points favourable to those whom we represent; but we feel it our duty still to be careful to maintain that the Judgment is of no spiritual validity. Our first and chief reason for this is that we believe it wrong to accept any new jurisdiction which the Head of the Church has not given, whatever temporary advantages may appear to be associated with it. This argument is of such overwhelming force that it excludes the possibility of our seriously weighing the apparent advantages and disadvantages of such jurisdiction: but even if it were not so, the probable ultimate consequences of accepting, not only the present, but any possible future Archbishop as sole judge in such matters are so serious that they may well induce the most ardent admirers of the present Archbishop, or even, considering the mode of appointment of Bishops, the most enthusiastic supporters of autocratic ecclesiastical rule, to pause before committing the Province to all the possible or probable decisions on doctrine and ritual of any possible or probable future Archbishop. We therefore refuse to regard the Judgment as an official and binding utterance of the Archbishop, and we proceed to discuss it as his Grace's personal opinion and nothing more, although as such it must and ought to have great weight and receive very serious consideration. Regarding it in this light, although it does not commend itself to us as entirely satisfactory on every point, we cannot withhold a deserved tribute of respectful admiration, especially when we consider the difficult circumstances surrounding the position of the Archbishop, the obvious intention of the Judgment to promote peace in the Church without sacrificing truth, the painful care and study bestowed upon it, and the probable success of this honest endeavour.

The Judgment, being evidently the result of wide reading and large-minded consideration of a difficult subject, provides material for prolonged and careful study, and throws fresh light upon many disputed points. A stronger case might perhaps have been made out, from our point of view, for some of the points allowed, and the decision on other points might have been different, if greater stress had been laid upon the fact that the English Church is but a part of the One Catholic Church, and that her directions and rules must be interpreted on Catholic principles, with due reference to the use of other parts of the Church. This principle is admitted in one place by the recognition of the lawfulness of what is "a primitive, continuous, and all but universal practice in the Church." But the principle is applied in the Judgment more in its negative aspect to the exclusion of disallowed points than in its positive aspect to the inclusion of allowed points. There is in this way a certain Protestant bias in the Judgment, although it must be acknowledged that the Archbishop has been careful to avoid all appearance of it. We have no right to assume that he has any personal bias, and least of all that he has any Protestant bias. Yet by the force of this tendency the Judgment becomes in effect something of a compromise. We do not impute to the Archbishop the intention of making a compromise. On the contrary, it is probably the result of the necessities of the case arising out of the circumstances in which he found himself placed.

The success of the Archbishop's endeavour to provide a peaceful solution of the dispute about Ritual depends upon the acceptance of the Judgment by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council when the questions come before it either in appeal from this decision, or in any future case that may come before it in the brief space that we hope remains before its place is taken by a competent Ecclesiastical Court. A Judgment based simply upon Catholic and canonical principles would not be likely to commend itself to the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Archbishop has been apparently careful to argue on such lines as would be acceptable to them, and it is difficult to see how they can fail to maintain his decision on the points allowed. They will have before them a far more complete case than from the circumstances of the position has been possible hitherto; and if, as is probable, they are convinced by the argument of the Archbishop, it will be a very distinct gain in reference to the prospects of peace; for there will be very little left for the Persecution Company to contend for. On this account, while we are sorry that the Archbishop has felt it right to claim jurisdiction as sole judge in the case, we are hopeful that good may come out of this evil; and we feel that, although the Judgment would not entirely satisfy us if we believed it to come from a court having spiritual jurisdiction, it is under the circumstances, in its most important features, calculated to meet the difficulties of the position in regard to the probable action of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and we therefore welcome it as a whole, taking it for what we have declared we believe it to be, as holding out a fair prospect of a peaceful solution of the Ritual disputes that have so long agitated the Church, and interfered with the progress of true spiritual work.

When the Judgment is examined in detail, there are found points which require more minute and exhaustive criticism than there is room for within the limits of this article. We can only touch upon the details here in a very general and superficial manner.

One thing we are very thankful for is the fact that, with one possible exception, the requirement that the manual acts must be seen by the congregation, which appears at first sight to substitute a south-eastward for the eastward position, which we believe to be the Archbishop's personal practice, and the whole of which question we must deal with more fully on another occasion, there is no point condemned which is so indisputably of truly Catholic usage as to be regarded as essential. The arguments for the lawfulness of the Eucharistic Lights, the Mixed Chalice, the Ablutions, and the eastward position, unless qualified as already referred to, are irresistible; and our hands will be greatly strengthened by an argument on these points from the most rigidly Anglican, not to say insular standpoint, which must carry conviction with it to all unprejudiced minds. These are points of Catholic usage, which no part of the Church can decide for itself, and which, therefore, no Anglican authority could forbid. The Archbishop, who referred in his Judgment to the force of local usage, would probably admit this. Such minor points as the time and place of mixing the chalice, and the question when the Sign of the Cross is to be used, are matters which may be decided by local authority, so that if the Archbishop had that authority which he claims, but which we maintain only belongs to the Provincial Synod, little fault could be found with his Judgment, except that legislation, as the Archbishop lays down, should never take place under the guise of judicial interpretation.

The Archbishop gave a masterly historical analysis of the interpretation of the expression "North End," as applied to the position of the celebrant at the commencement of the service, and his arguments, it will be noted, cover the contention of those who, adopting the old English rule, commence the service at the Southern part of the West side. The Archbishop readily accepts the fact that literal compliance with the rubric in its original sense is impossible. We gratefully notice the repudiation of the theory that omission implies prohibition, though we cannot quite follow the Archbishop when he says that a ceremony that was not in use before the Reformation must in all cases be unlawful if not explicitly ordered, so that there can be no development or formation of use. We do not allude to unmeaning imitations of foreign customs which are inconsistent with the structure or rubrics of our own Liturgy; but to reasonable customs which may be formed on Catholic principles in accordance with our own written law, and which may or may not be practised in other parts of the Church. It has been very justly said that some people hold that the English Church died in 1662, and left a will of which the lawyers are the executors and trustees. The Archbishop claimed that the English Church has a certain power (we are not sure how much) to order and change ceremonies. We agree with him so far that as a true living part of the Church she has power to order and change ceremonies, subject to the wider authority of the whole Church, and that not only by way of legislation, but by way of custom or use.

We have space only very briefly to ask attention to one or two other weak points in the Judgment which need to be pointed out lest some should be led to regard all the conclusions as sound by the display of learning shown on most points. And here we must notice that where we cannot agree with the conclusions arrived at, it is easy for the most part to show that the Judgment is inconsistent with itself.

For instance, the Archbishop, having shown by an elaborate argument that there was a sufficient reason for ordering the Breaking of the Bread "before the people" in the ordinary sense of "*coram populo,*" the very sense in which the promoters of the suit use the expression "before the people" in the charge in reference to the ablutions, nevertheless, without any grounds alleged, except the statement that "the tenor of the Common Prayer is openness," orders that the fraction is to be in sight of the people, although he has elsewhere laid down that where expressions are of doubtful interpretation, no reasonable interpretation is to be excluded. It is also to be noticed that the Revisers did not, as the Archbishop himself points out, take the words suggested by the Puritan divines "in the sight of," but Bishop Cosin's words "before the people." If, as the Archbishop says in another place, the omission of the direction to mix water with the wine at the time of the offertory shows intention that the mixing was not to take place there, then on the same principle the deliberate use of the words "before the people," instead of the suggested words "in the sight of the people" must be taken to imply that the words used were not intended to have the meaning of "in the sight of the people." Again, if the argument that "the tenor of the Common Prayer is openness" is to override all other considerations in one place, it ought to prevail in regard to the mixing of the chalice, which, however, the Archbishop, with singular inconsistency, seems to argue should be done secretly. The last word has not been said on these points, and we propose to return to them with a view to throwing fresh light upon them by the help of the Archbishop's arguments, in accordance with the principle laid down in the Judgment that it does not claim to have established finality, and that its conclusions are subject to the introduction of fresh light.

In spite of the criticisms which we have felt bound to make, and which we have endeavoured to set forth with all due respect to the Archbishop, we are thankful that the Judgment marks a new departure in ecclesiastical controversy, and shows considerable progress in the acceptance of Catholic truth.

We conclude with an earnest exhortation to our friends to lay to heart the fact, rightly insisted upon by many Bishops, that the Judgment does not profess to affect directly any one except the Bishop of Lincoln, and not to act hastily upon it in any direction. Nothing would, in our opinion, be more disastrous than a general rash adoption of the points of ritual which are in the opinion of the Archbishop lawful. Nothing would be so likely to provoke this as hasty compliance with the Archbishop's suggestions in the other direction. Such ill-considered action would, in all probability, utterly destroy, or, at least, indefinitely postpone, the hopes of peace held out by the new turn of events. We plead earnestly that, while the Archbishop's argument calls for careful and earnest study, no action may be taken rashly upon it by those whom it does not directly affect, because we are confident that hasty action in either direction would be extremely mischievous, and would defeat the very end which the Archbishop evidently has in view, the prevention of litigation and the promotion of peace. At the same time, those who have already adopted the disputed points, or who may, in the course of time, see their way on right principles to their adoption, will find their hands strengthened by this expression of opinion on the part of one so highly respected and filling such a dignified post as the Archbishop of Canterbury.

II.

THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN'S CASE.

From *The Guardian* (Conservative), November 26, 1890.

THE anxiety with which Churchmen waited for the judgment in this great case was twofold. It concerned alike the manner and the matter of the decision. In the former regard, questions were astir whether the judgment would be such as should proceed from the Archbishop of Canterbury, the successor of St. Augustine and St. Anselm, the Primate of an historic Church; whether it would be true to Catholic tradition, in the grounds on which it rested, in the authority to which it yielded deference, in the evidence it afforded of a liberty in things spiritual uncompromised and uninfringed by secular control; whether it would possess those qualities of strength and thoroughness and distinction which men honour anywhere, but demand in acts of this importance. And in the latter regard, concerning the contents of the judgment, there was a wide anxiety, with varying emphasis, as to the verdict which would be pronounced on each of the nine charges brought against the Bishop of Lincoln by the promoters of the suit.

In its character and manner—let it be frankly and thankfully acknowledged—the judgment leaves very little to be desired. It is a document which may hold a high place among the records of ecclesiastical judicature; it is conceived and worked out in a way which brings new hope into the aspect of affairs. In an age when hesitation and faint-heartedness are apt to take the place of statesmanship, the Archbishop of Canterbury has done a more courageous thing than any prelate has even attempted for many years. In an age of hasty talk and general impressions he has taken ample time to consider and elaborate his decision, and the judgment which he read on Friday last shows how well the time has been employed. In thorough and exact inquiry, in care for detail, in justice of thought, in clearness of statement, in candour and ability and force, it is a work of rare excellence; while there is no room for reasonable doubt as to the reality of the freedom with which the evidence is examined and the verdict formed on each successive point. The judgment is genuinely and plainly the judgment of the Archbishop and his Assessors; substantially it might have stood as it is had no other Court attempted to deal with any of the questions at issue.

Such is the character of this vigorous and weighty utterance; and no misgiving as to that which has preceded or may follow it ought to make men grudging in their recognition of its intrinsic merit and significance. But with regard to the decisions reached upon the contested points, it is more difficult to speak either briefly or with unhindered satisfaction. For the greater part of the judgment High Churchmen have good reason to be glad, far better reason probably than most of them expected; at point after point one feels how much the security of their position is advanced by the more thorough and appreciative study which at last has been given to the evidence. But, unhappily, as the strength of a chain is the strength of its weakest link, so the practical worth and hopefulness of a complex scheme which is meant for wide acceptance does not rise above its most unpromising element. And there is something very unpromising in the ruling of the Court, that in the consecration of the Holy Eucharist "the manual acts must be performed in such wise as to be visible to the communicants properly placed." If the judgment fails to bear the part it ultimately should bear in the furtherance of the Church's cause, it will fail by reason of these words. For they bring in a novel practice or gesture in the case of all who take the eastward position; in conception, in tone of thought, in scientific character and dignity, they seem to fall plainly below the level of the work with which they stand; they demand what will to many seem an untimely deference to an unreasonable suspicion; they may come to be much misused by the perverse and captious; and they will in many cases force men to recall, in the most awful moment of their ministerial action, the thoughts which then, at all events, they long to banish. It is not, indeed, impossible to conform to the ruling without swerving from the eastward position; but it is not natural, nor is it by any means easy to decide how it may best be done. And in view of the extreme importance which, both in relation to the due fulfilment of the Sacramental Mystery, and also by the whole tenour of the Church's law, belongs to the manual acts, it does not seem wise or fair to impose a requirement such as that embodied in the judgment, without facing the practical difficulties which will be found in obeying it, and without giving clear and full direction as to the way in which those difficulties are to be met; while it is likely that, if the ruling of the Court comes to be enforced, some may devise ways of complying with it by which grave trouble may be provoked. It seems a grievous pity that the judgment should be hampered by the disadvantage and disfigurement which this one decision introduces into it, and that the Archbishop has let slip the opportunity of saying simply that the time has not yet come for any absolute determination as to the position of the Celebrant at the Altar; and that both positions, the eastward and the southward, ought in justice for the present to be recognized and sanctioned. We believe that the simplicity and equity of such a statement, indisputably warranted by the evidence which the Archbishop has adduced, would have secured from men of all parties, and of none, a degree of deference which is hardly likely to be commanded by an utterance which attaches to the recognition of the eastward position a requirement so awkward and unhistorical that it may go far to spoil the character and outcome of the decision on this point.

With regard to the line which the Bishop of Lincoln may pursue, we can have nothing to express save a deep gratitude that, at what can hardly fail to prove an eventful moment in the Church's history, the first and most conspicuous determination has to be formed by one who is quite sure to act with a pure and single purpose; one who is as far removed from impatience as he is from fear; one who will command and warrant the utmost trust of all who know him. But with regard to the extension of that personal bearing which is as yet all that properly belongs to the Archbishop's judgment, a few words may be here said.

It has been often urged in these columns that, whatever the judgment might be, it would have no bearing upon the duty of individual priests save where it was in some regular way communicated or promulgated to them by their own Bishop. It is greatly to be desired that the measure of reserve and patience which is thus indicated may be generally exercised. It is due to the Archbishop that the example of deliberate and painstaking thought which he has set should be followed in the sequel of his work. It is due to the Episcopate that the right of every Bishop himself to give directions to his own clergy should be steadily respected. The court from which this judgment comes may in some future age produce another of a very different character; and then the safety of the Church may depend upon the sheltering power of that diocesan authority which would be ignored if the clergy were in the present case to regard themselves as taking their instructions directly from the chair of Canterbury. Moreover, a newspaper report can hardly be treated as a canonical vehicle for the exercise of the Episcopal office in the guidance of the Church's action. The next step in the very difficult and perilous course which the Archbishop's judgment may prove to have initiated for the Church must be taken by the Bishops severally, by each on his own responsibility, for his own diocese. What that step should be they have by-and-by to settle; and it is a question which demands great prudence and calmness and considerateness for its right solution. When the Bishops speak, a new stage in the long crisis will have come ; but until they speak it can hardly be doubted that the duty of the clergy is to wait. A certain number of people will probably rush at the Archbishop's judgment with the same tumultuous and troublesome impetuosity which sometimes brings an unhappy crowd to precipitate and misunderstand and interrupt the work which a man of science knows that he can only carry forward if he is left to give to it in his laboratory all the time it needs. But it may be hoped that the majority of Churchmen will show in the present instance somewhat more of a reasonable and respectful patience ; owning very thankfully that the hard work and sincerity and ability of the Archbishop and his Assessors have given to the Church of England a document so strong and honest that it can hardly fail to bear fruit for good ; but remembering that the surest and the commonest way to waste and ruin such a gift is to try to make it bear its fruit before its time has come.

III.

JUDGMENT AT LAST.

From *The Rock* (Low Church), November 28, 1890.

THE Archbishop's judgment has the merit of satisfying nobody. Its unique cleverness is in having defined the word "wine" in the English language as identical with wine *plus* water, and in having declared that candles lit during the broad daylight are not lit for any ceremonial purpose. The Archbishop does not condescend to instruct us about the purpose for which they are lighted. Of the seven charges, the Bishop of Lincoln has been acquitted upon five and convicted upon two. He is enjoined to so consecrate the elements that the manual acts may "be visible to the communicants properly placed," and he must not make the sign of the Cross, either in giving the Absolution or the final Benediction. He may have the *Agnus Dei* sung before the reception of the elements ; he may adopt the eastward position ; he may mix water with the sacramental wine provided he does it before the service, and either in the vestry or at a credence table ; he may perform the ablutions after the service with such attendant function as he pleases ; and he may have, as we have mentioned already, two lights on the Communion-table, "when not wanted for the purpose of giving light," "nothing having been performed or done, which comes under the definition of a ceremony, by the presence of two still lights alight before it begins and until after it ends." We apologize to our readers for what may be an undignified attitude toward a solemn and a weighty judgment, but we are driven to it in the very bitterness of our heart, when we think we see the most sacred institutions and services treated in the piteously trivial spirit in which the Archbishop's judgment has dealt with them. If his Grace had intended to bring contempt upon the whole business he could not have done so more effectually. One omission we notice ; he does not appear to have read the Homilies. Possibly they are too modern history for him.

Naturally, the Archbishop leaned as much toward the advanced Church party as he conscientiously could. His sympathies are drawn thitherward. It was to be expected that he would do what he could to screen an episcopal brother, and to let him down as gently as he could. Thus he gave no costs in the cause ; he pronounced no sentence upon the Bishop ; and he made nasty reflections upon the witnesses. They are no more "hired" because they are paid than his Grace is "hired" because he has his salary of 15,000*l.* a year. There must be technical witnesses where technical testimony is demanded, and such witnesses are no more deserving of animadversion than professional witnesses would be in other cases. Before such an elaborate ceremonial as we now have the ordinary uninstructed worshipper is bewildered, and his evidence would soon break down under the astute cross-examination of wily counsel. We do not like these prosecutions, and therefore would rather they were not preferred. But we cannot allow those who are of another opinion to be abused as though they were mean spies and low detectives because they do that which in their consciences they believe to be for the public good. We understand that there is to be an appeal to the Privy Council, so that after all this tedious litigation we are just where we were. Nevertheless, we doubt if the Bishop of Lincoln's friends are altogether comforted, although they have been so abundantly blessed. Will they be pleased at an acquittal on the score that these ceremonies are not ceremonies, and have no particular significance? The more strenuous spirits among them have always contended that their ritual was insisted upon because of its teaching efficacy. It will scarcely please them to be told so by a "spiritual court." How will the following sentences from the judgment gratify them ? "The Court decides that the mixing of the wine in, and as a part of the service is against the law of the Church." "It would have been illegal to vary the service by making 'the Ceremony of Ablution' charged in the Articles." In the Jewish ritual the shedding of the blood was at that place which lay "on the side of the altar toward the north." The position of the celebrant does not "convey any intrinsic error or erroneous shade of doctrine." The *Agnus Dei* may not be "the aptest anthem for use here." "To condemn the singing of that text here as unsound in doctrine would be contrary to the real force of Ridley's injunction, and to other unexceptionable Protestant teaching."

The Church Association have issued advance sheets of an article on the judgment, which article will be published in the December number of their *Church Intelligencer.* They complain about the Archbishop's setting aside the judgments of the Privy Council. These judgments decided that altar-lights are illegal, and could not hold that "if the mingling and administering in the service water and wine is an additional ceremony, and so unlawful, it becomes lawful by removing from the service the act of mingling." The Church Association stigmatize the judgment as a "New Light" judgment, and criticise in detail its historical inaccuracies. For example, the Archbishop quotes Burnet as stating that great contests arose in 1550 as to whether the table should be placed "lengthwise" or "crosswise," although these words, "lengthwise" and "crosswise," marked by the Archbishop with quotation marks, were never "heard of at that period." They also charge the Archbishop with having had in his selection of authorities a preference for partisan writers, and they allege that the eastward position "from 1552 to our own day was never once used by any one clergyman as a habit, or for other than temporary reasons of a personal, exceptional, or local character." In conclusion, they assert that this judgment, "so far from adducing much 'new light,' is remarkable for the mere *rechauffé* which it furnishes of materials from Chambers, Scudamore, and Morton Shaw."

The one value of the judgment will be that it will divert public attention from mere Ritual details to central doctrines. It will serve to show how small and capricious are these various ceremonies, signifying one set of ideas to one set of minds, and a totally different set of ideas to another class of thinkers. They are but banners and flags, whose symbolism is arbitrary, and therefore may vary in different hands and according to different usages. We know well enough and sadly enough what they are intended to teach as they are used in our churches now. But it is always a puzzling matter to affix in a law court the exact shade of intention, and in a criminal trial, where English habit affords the accused every loophole, it is easy for the defendant to elude justice. We are thankful that these Episcopal assessors one and all felt themselves bound to repudiate Roman doctrine. *Corruptio optimi pessima*, but the degeneration of our Church of England has not become such that an Archbishop could defiantly assume and defend Roman doctrine. We cannot disguise from ourselves the fact that clerical judges can never be impartial ones upon clerical questions. They will, quite unconsciously to themselves, but nevertheless really, reflect their own clerical bias. History will always be construed into what the student wishes. A Froude can whitewash Henry VIII., a Carlyle can manufacture a saint out of Cromwell. Most learned is the Archbishop's little thesis; we only wish it had in it more of the spirit of those which Luther nailed on the church door at Wittenberg.

THE IMPREGNABLE ROCK OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

From *The Sunday-School Times*, Philadelphia, November 1, 1890.

Concluding Thoughts.

In closing this series of papers, it is right to record the admission that they can lay no claim to anything more than touching, and that slightly, certain parts of a great subject. They omit many things important, perhaps some things essential. The paper on the Creation Story, indeed, aims at bringing out what seems to me a distinct and specific argument in proof of a Divine Revelation. Except in that instance, their main design is to draw out, so far as they go, the force of that cumulative evidence witnessing to such a Revelation, which has been so wisely summed up by Bishop Butler;* and also to disembarrass belief in it from those difficulties which properly belong, not to itself, but to exaggerations and excrescences against which it can carry no absolute guarantee. They form the testimony of an old man, in the closing period of his life. It is rendered with no special qualification but possibly this one. Few men of our British race have lived through a longer period of incessant argumentative contention, or have had a more diversified experience in trying to ascertain, for purposes immediately practical, the difference between tenable and untenable positions. Such experience is directly conversant with the nature of man and his varied relations; and I own my inclination to suppose that it is more germane to the treatment of subjects that lie directly between collective man and the Author of his being, more calculated to neutralize deficiencies, though not to impart capacity, than a familiarity with those material sciences which have supplied an arena for, perhaps, the most splendid triumphs of the century now far advanced in its decline. On this subject has been recorded the nobly candid admission of Mr. Darwin* respecting the possible atrophy, through disuse, of the mental organs on which our higher tastes depend. Among those organs I cannot but include the organ of belief. On this subject, however, I am a biassed witness. It is for others to judge. I only offer a plea, not in proof of ability, but in extenuation of defect.

---

* "Analogy," Part II., Chap. VII.

There is in certain circles a very confident disposition to assert that, as regards belief in supernaturalism, the intellectual battle has been fought and won, and that victory is on the side of negation. It ought to be observed, before proceeding further, that supernaturalism is a term which includes the idea of God. A sense may be, indeed, loosely given to it, which confines it to the mode of his manifestations. But, essentially, if God be there, the supernatural is there; and the developments which proceed from that idea, even if they had been crushed and stamped out, might germinate again. It is not, then, a question of excrescences or of details; the life and essence of religion are at stake. It is the question of belief in what is not perhaps scientifically, but yet intelligibly, termed a personal God.

I shall presently enter on the moral causes which may have contributed, and even mainly contributed, to stimulate the negative tendencies of the day. I am now only endeavoring partially to test the justice of a Pæan, which is not warranted even by the established fact of a victory; it must be a victory belonging to that class of victories which end the war.

That such a song is raised, there can be little doubt. It seems to have inspired the recent Articles of that very distinguished and not less upright writer, Professor Huxley, in the Nineteenth Century. But I have never seen a better example of the plenary satisfaction which possesses the mind of many negative athletes than in the following passage, taken from a writer of ability:

> "I set out from the standpoint that the mission of Freethought is no longer to batter down old faiths. That has been long ago effectively accomplished; and I, for one, am ready to put a railing round the ruins, that they may be preserved from desecration, and serve as a landmark! Indeed, I confess to having yawned over a recent vigorous indictment of Christianity."*

This purposes to be a description of a certain state of facts!† Now, it is not the first time that we have heard description of the kind. Such a description was supplied in the following lines by no less a person than Bishop Butler, who, I apprehend, was not among those given to exaggeration. His words are these:‡

> "It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons, that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry; but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious. And, accordingly, they treat it as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment, and nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals, for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world."

It seems pretty plain that at the time when the Bishop published the Analogy,§ a wave of unbelief was passing over the land. The spiritual declension of the Hanoverian period had set in; and the standard of life, and of the ideas current concerning life, was sinking almost from day to day. The negative movement of the period may have been quite as vigorous, as widespread, and as self-confident, as that of which we now feel the pressure. Yet it dwindled, and almost disappeared; and we may even say that, at the time of Johnson's social predominance, it left hardly a trace behind.‖ Nor was this either the first or the last of the reverses which negation has suffered. At the time of the great Renascence of ancient learning in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the cultivated mind of Europe sank far back into Paganism; but that ebb was succeeded by a flowing tide. Again, in my own earlier days, say in the second quarter of the present century, there was a great revival both of the dogmatic sense and of the religious life in England; and the temper of the time, in the thinking world, was strongly adverse alike to worldliness, to indifference, and to unbelief. In the third quarter, however, the sceptical movement set in with a wide and subtle power. No man, perhaps, was better qualified to pass a judgment on this subject than the late Dr. Whewell; and he, writing in November, 1853, and referring to an opinion expressed by a contemporary of smaller calibre than himself, says, "As to his assertion that scepticism is increasing, it is contrary to all my knowledge of the cultivated classes."* History, then, seems to prove that these negative movements are subject, not only to a hazard, but even to a law of mutation; and that every one of them, when it has done its work, may cease to be. Of one thing we may be assured: such a movement derives no real strength, no true promise of permanence, from an overweening self-assertion. The question is not what negation thinks of itself and of the opposing forces, but what is the intrinsic strength of the reasoning on which it rests.

---

* "Life and Letters," Vol. I., pp. 101, 102.

* Karl Pearson, "Ethics of Free Thought," Preface, p. 5. The dramatic character of this declaration is brought to its climax by the fact that the work is dedicated to the members of King's College, Cambridge.

† It is far from being isolated. The same ideas are expressed with greater vehemence by Dr. Hardwick, of Sheffield, in a preface to "Evolution." London, 1890.

‡ From the Advertisement to the "Analogy."

§ In 1736.

‖ In 1797, when Wilberforce published his "Practical View," he spoke of "absolute unbelievers" as a class which he feared was an increasing one (Chap. VII., sec. 3). Perhaps the great war of the years 1793–1815 tended to debilitate the religious mind of the country by drawing off mental force in another direction. I have, however, heard from persons of high authority, who were old when I was young, that the French Revolution generated a distinctly religious reaction on this side of the Channel.

I have said that, when it has done its work, it may cease to be. For doubtless it has a work to do. The wave that breaks and foams upon the rock exhibits to us not merely, as it might seem, a picture of violence and a source of danger, but a fraction of the vast oceanic movement, which is the indispensable condition of health and purity both to the water and the air, and to the populations by which they are respectively inhabited. If we believe in Providential government, we might rationally believe, even where we did not see, that those boastful, and even powerful, agencies, are not without their purposes prefigured, and bounded, too, in the counsels of God. It seems, however, not difficult to discern a portion of those purposes; which may have been, first, to dispel the lethargy and stimulate the zeal of believers; and, secondly, to admonish their faith to keep terms with reason, by testing it at all its points; lest fancy, or pride, or indolence, or the intolerant spirit of sect or party, should have imported into their beliefs merely human elements that it may be very needful to eject.

Whether it be in blindness or not, the champions of negation ought to understand that it remains just as possible now as it was in the early or middle ages, to uphold belief in perfect good faith and with immovable conviction. In the advance of scientific knowledge, and of the critical art, I for one see much that corrects and chastens our persuasions concerning the subjects of belief, but nothing that disintegrates or undermines the basis of belief itself.

It is sometimes taken for granted, or alleged, that religion or its champions are reduced to the necessity of defending their cause only with arms which have been superseded by the introduction of forces previously unknown, or by new forms of construction better adapted to their ends. In a work which seems to fluctuate between pity and a good-natured contempt, Professor Huxley describes "the old-fashioned artillery of the Churches" on the one side, and "the weapons of precision" used by the advancing forces of science on the other.* Now let it be remembered that we have not here to do with the masses of mankind, to whom historical and scientific arguments, whether negative or affirmative, are, and probably must remain, inaccessible We are speaking of that standing army, so to call it, of more or less instructed persons, who, on the one side and the other, execute all the fighting on behalf of the community at large. Writing then of those within the palisades of the lists, and not appealing to mere numbers, I demur entirely to the statement of Professor Huxley. I deny that the weapons of belief are antiquated: I pause even before admitting that those of scientific men are always, except in their own particular sciences, weapons of precision. When we decline the appeal to the established facts of science, or to the conclusions upheld or reasonably sustained by human experience through history, or when we fall into the trap laid for us by Hume, and treat the acceptance of our "holy religion" as a matter in no way amenable to the review of reason; then we may be justly charged with the use of weapons no longer serviceable. But until then we may quietly endeavor to proceed as rational beings upon rational considerations. If these principles have not uniformly guided me in the composition of the papers I am now bringing to a close (on which it is not for me to judge), at least I can say that there has not been in any instance, even by a hair's breadth, an intentional deviation from them.

---

* "Life of Whewell," p. 431.

* Nineteenth Century, July, 1890, p. 22.

The fact, however, of a strong and widespread negative movement among our countrymen during the latter portion of this century is admitted; and now I propose to offer some remarks upon its alleged or probable causes.

I shall speak, first, of the detriment which religion is supposed to have suffered through the great and wonderful advance both of science and of rational speculation, mostly physical, but also critical, archæological, and historical.

Secondly, of the detriment it has suffered through the exposure of erroneous opinions about religion which are due to believers themselves: a detriment attending, in different manners and degrees, either the retention, or even the abandonment, of such opinions.

Thirdly, of the strength which the negation movement has in my opinion derived from causes greatly and subtly effective, and wholly extrinsic to itself; and which I take to constitute its principal strength.

Of the first head I might dispose very briefly. I have enumerated some of the great services which science has rendered, and is rendering, to religion. Of the damage it has inflicted I have heard much; but the allegations commonly appear to me upon examination to be found untrue: in some cases, like that of the first chapter of Genesis, to be not only untrue, but contradictory of the truth, as science, when just principles of interpretation are called in, is found to have established what it has been said to have destroyed.

The nearest semblance, that has attracted my notice, to palpable contradiction between modern science and Holy Writ, is upon the statement that sin brought death into the world, whereas we now know that death was antecedent to the introduction of sin. But in Scripture, beyond all dispute, the word "death" has many senses. For example, it means habitually, severance of spirit from body. It means separation from God, and domination of body over spirit.* It means reunion with God, and domination of spirit over body.† As it means the soul's disease, severance from God, so also it means the final consummation of that disease in the second death. These are the senses of the term dispersed about the Bible. How do we know that St. Paul used the words in the first of these, and not in the second? And if he had used it in the first sense, and had intended to declare that there was no physical death before the sin of Adam, how much would this prove? Only that the apostle was ignorant of the pre-Adamite history of the world, and that we should have to ask whether such ignorance, when proved, would destroy or impair the overflowing proofs that he was commissioned of God to speak, and was taught of God how to speak, for the salvation of the world.

It remains, however, a vital portion of our duty, on the one hand, to estimate and to measure aright the differences between the Divine Revelation in itself, and the subjective conceptions entertained and propagated concerning it; and on the other to inquire pretty strictly whether the professors of science are sometimes apt to push their legitimate authority beyond their own bounds into provinces where it becomes a usurpation, and whether the weapons which they hurl are then always "weapons of precision."

On the first of these two points I will give an illustration of my meaning from the latest writings of the Achilles of the opposing army. In a very recent article, which deals chiefly with the Deluge,* Mr. Huxley, in a succinct but decided way, administers capital punishment also to the Creation Story of Genesis. He does not enter much into particulars, but he says the Israelites were like all other men curious to know their origin. Now, so far as the records of the past go, the cosmological curiosity of the ancients appears to have been small. The cosmologies of Babylon and Egypt hold an utterly insignificant place in their systems of knowledge. The Greeks, perhaps the most inquisitive of men, cared little or nothing for these things through many centuries, after they had felt the passion of high poetry and the legends associated with it; and when their schools of philosophy arose, they dealt with the origin of material things rather than of men. There was no nation, I believe, except the Israelites, whose cosmology held a classical place in their memory and in their devotions. But I am perhaps wrong in arguing the question. What I ought rather to point out is that while Professor Huxley is fond, as he well may be, of claiming to represent science, this *dictum* is entirely outside the sciences he represents.

Again, in the same short space he proceeds to lay it down that an opinion given by Dr. Riehm on the subject of the seven Mosaic days (that is, that they are natural days) should be final. We claim, however, to be, if not freethinkers, yet free thinkers. Why are we to renounce the faculty of discourse, to square our minds to those of Dr. Riehm, to let him do the thinking for us, and to accept his words as "final"? Simply because Mr. Huxley has said so. What right has Professor Huxley to close this question? For the question whether the Creation Story of Genesis describes solar days or not, is no more a scientific question, than whether Parliament should or should not meet in November, or whether Shakespeare wrote or did not write the whole of "Henry VIII."

---

* Luke 1 : 79; John 8 : 51; Eph. 2 : 1.
† Col. 2 : 20; 3 : 3; 2 Tim. 2 : 11.

* Nineteenth Century, July, 1890, p. 21.

But I have now to ask whether the weapons used by this most distinguished scientist are always "weapons of precision"? On scientific grounds he condemns, as we have seen, the narrative of the Deluge, and pronounces it to be fabulous. One of his reasons is this. The Mosaic account assigns a period of one hundred and fifty days (the Tablets give only seven) for the subsidence of the waters. Against this statement Mr. Huxley advances a *dictum,* of which the subject-matter is unquestionably scientific. He gives the length of the Mesopotamian plain[*] at three to four hundred miles, and the elevation of the higher end at five to six hundred feet. Had this plain been so covered with water, says Mr. Huxley, a "furious torrent" would have rushed downward, and instead of a hundred and fifty days the plain generally (this word no doubt is meant to except particular hollows) would have been left bare in a very few hours.

Let us try this question a little more nearly. If the length of the plain be 350 miles, and the fall 525 feet, we have a descent of one foot and a half per mile; and this descent, says the Professor, would cause a furious torrent, such as would clear the plain in a very few hours. Let us assume twenty miles an hour as the rate of the "furious torrent," on which assumption the plain would be bare in seventeen and a half hours. I take these rates and figures so as to translate approximately into definite quantities Mr. Huxley's more general expressions.

One foot and a half per mile represent a gradient of $\frac{1}{3420}$. I have sought information on this subject from an engineer who is in charge of a portion of one of our rivers. I understand from him that a fall of one in three thousand four hundred and twenty would probably produce a current of about two miles an hour. It may require all Professor Huxley's resources to show that a current of two miles an hour is a "furious torrent;" or that to represent as a furious torrent what is in truth an extremely slow stream is to use a "weapon of precision."

My informant, indeed, adds that each case has modifying circumstances of its own, and must be judged by itself; but he likewise tells me that if, instead of taking an ordinary English river, we remove the banks, and suppose the stream indefinitely widened, the fall remaining the same, the rate of the current would be not increased but slackened. Thus we seem to get farther and farther from the "weapons of precision." And it seems just possible that, after all, these weapons may, either, like our monster guns, sometimes damage those who handle them, or may fail to batter down so soon as expected the undoubtedly ancient walls of the fortress of belief.[*]

The case to which I have last referred is one of elementary hydraulics. The obligation to be precise may be thought to rise with the elevation of the subject. If we may not ask from the scientific man that when he touches questions of the innermost feelings of believers, and of the highest destinies of man, he should be reverent, yet surely we are entitled to require of him that he should be circumspect; that he should take reasonable care to include in his survey of a case all elements which are obviously essential to a right judgment upon it.

In another recent article,[†] Mr. Huxley has touched very lofty ground indeed. He selects as a crucial case for the trial of the Gospels, and with them of the character of our Lord, the miracle which happened in the country of the Gergesenes, or Gadarenes. It is narrated, with certain variations, by three evangelists; the essential point being, that evil spirits, cast out from the body of a demoniac, are permitted to enter into a herd of swine, which rushes furiously into the sea. Mr. Huxley, as a physiologist, disbelieves in demoniacal possession, and that is the point that has commonly attracted the chief share of attention in connection with this miracle. Such a physiological judgment it is not for me to discuss. But he also very properly touches the question of the injury inflicted by the destruction of the swine, which was due to our Lord's permission. Mr. Huxley observes that the evangelist has no "inkling of the legal and moral difficulties of the case," and adds, the devils entered into the swine "to the great loss and damage of the innocent Gerasene or Gadarene pig-owners." Further, "Everything that I know of law and justice convinces me that the wanton destruction of other people's property is a misdemeanor of evil example."

---

[*] Nineteenth Century, July, 1890, p. 14.

[*] It is not without interest to remark that, on the data before us, the time required for clearing the plain would be about 162 hours, or nearly seven days, the actual time mentioned in the Babylonian account.

[†] Nineteenth Century, February, 1889, pp. 171, 172.

So, then, after eighteen centuries of worship offered to our Lord by the most cultivated, the most developed, and the most progressive portion of the human race, it has been reserved to a scientific inquirer to discover that he was no better than a lawbreaker and an evil-doer. It is sometimes said that the greatest discoveries are the most simple. And this, if really a discovery, is the simplest of them all. So simple that he who runs may read, for it lies on the very surface of the page. The ordinary reader can only put the wondering question, how, in such a matter, came the honors of originality to be reserved to our time and to Professor Huxley?

Simple as it has been from his point of view, the case* is to a reflective mind a very peculiar one. It offers the only occasion on which our Lord exercised, or co-operated in the exercise of preternatural power for the destruction of life.

It is observable that in certain instances, such as that of the fig-tree, and of the ass with her colt, he seems to assert himself as the universal owner. He is the Lord to kill, as well as to make alive, according to his wisdom. But this consideration, to whatever conclusion it might lead, is of what may be termed an esoteric nature, and is hardly suited to an argument against the negative school, who are plainly entitled to raise the question as it affects the right of property. Why, then, does our Lord in this instance see cause to vary from the philanthropic and beneficent tendencies which usually mark his miraculous agency? It has been observed that the entrance into the swine may have been permitted, in order to certify the man or men relieved of the reality of the great and hardly credible deliverance. And again, that the willing departure of the demons may have spared the victim or victims from the tortures which it is natural to suppose would have attended their violent ejection. Yet something more seems to be desired in order to meet the question that has just been raised. I find the answer to it in the reasonable, and (as it seems to me) almost necessary supposition, that the possession of the swine was unlawful, and, therefore, justly punishable by their loss.

The scene is described by different evangelists in different terms. It is the country of the Gergesenes, or the country of the Gadarenes. The distinction is immaterial to the present purpose. It was apparently part of the land of the Girgashites,* one of the seven Canaanitish nations, and was subject, therefore, as a matter of religious obligation, to the Mosaic law. Now that law contained a prohibition to use various meats, among which pork was included. But in the case of swine the law went furthur, and it was forbidden even to touch the carcass,† which of course precluded all use of them whatever when dead; and it was only for use when dead that there could be any object in keeping the animal. Nor was this prohibition merely ceremonial. It was immediately related to the health of the people, as the use of pork (I am informed) produces the disease called trichinosis, and I understand that the veto is down to this day regarded by well-informed Jews as of a serious importance.

Mr. Huxley, exercising his rapid judgment on the text, does not appear to have encumbered himself with the labor of inquiring what anybody else had known or said about it. He has thus missed a point which might have been set up in support of his accusation against our Lord. Some commentators have alleged the authority of Josephus for stating that Gadara was a city of Greeks rather than of Jews, from whence it might be inferred that to keep swine was innocent and lawful. This is not quite the place for a critical examination of the case; but I have examined it, and have satisfied myself that Josephus gives no reason whatever to suppose that the population of Gadara, still more the population of the neighborhood, and most of all the swine-herding or lower‡ portion of that population, were other than Hebrews, bound by the Mosaic law. Now, this being the case, the punishment inflicted upon the owners of the swine, by the permission of our Lord, did not constitute a breach, but rather a vindication, of the law; as a law would be vindicated if casks of smuggled spirits were caught and broken open after landing, and their contents wasted on the ground. Surely, if these were only possibilities, instead of rather cogent likelihoods, they should have been examined and weighed before pronouncing sentence on One who, apart from all other claims, must be supposed to have had some considerable reason for deviating from his usually beneficent and gentle methods. And, again, such hand-over-head reasoning is hard to reconcile either with the judicial temper, or with the claim, nay, the exclusive claim, to the honor of using "weapons of precision."

---

* Matt. 8 : 30 ; Mark 5 : 2 ; Luke 8 : 31.

* Deut. 7 : 1.

† Lev. 40 : 7, 8.

‡ It is clear that such people could not be the owners of 2.000 swine. But (1) this is stated in St. Mark only; (2) it is stated in a parenthesis, whereas it would naturally appear in the direct narrative; (3) so large a number suggests the error of a copyist, or very possibly a marginal gloss.

There is yet another point of great importance, in regard to which I desire to challenge the methods pursued by some critics of the Holy Scriptures; and I cannot do better than again proceed on the Flood paper of Professor Huxley. He finds, on the one hand, a vast mass of diversified tradition which agrees in reporting a flood. He finds that, as we draw near to that central seat of civilization in Chaldea, from which Abraham probably carried the Hebrew narration, it unfolds largely into detail, and that the tradition which thus emigrated is supported in many very remarkable particulars by the narrative which has been recorded in the Tablets. Finding, however, in the Mosaic story, various statements which he deems to be irreconcilable with natural laws, he protests, not against those particular statements, but against the entire relation; and he casts aside, not only the whole tale as it is given in Genesis, but the large mass of collateral testimony from every quarter of the globe which supports it. Is this a scientific, is it a philosophical, is it altogether a rational, method of proceeding? Errors, and even great errors, may creep into a true narration. This is a case where the tale had, according to all appearances, been carried orally for ages, perhaps for very many ages, before the race that have transmitted it to us had the means of giving it a written form. Was it not likely that much variation of particulars would creep in? Could they be shut out except by miracle, and has the Christian Church ever taught us to believe in such a miracle? Is it not the fact that the essence of the story remains in absolute integrity? A divine warning, a woful prevalence of sin, a terrible inundation or deluge as a punishment, the rescue of a small and righteous remnant; not only do these things remain, but traditions supporting them in several or in all points have descended to us independently through a hundred channels; and we are now asked to believe that, in each of these, imagination, and imagination only, has been at work, and that in each of them it has worked with an essentially identical result. May not this be to substitute for a great physical a greater moral miracle, and are we not even in some danger of exchanging the unaccountable for the absurd?

My conclusion, then, upon this part of the subject, be it worth much or little, is threefold. I am grateful to science, both physical and historical, for the great services it has rendered to the belief by the establishment of truths, or the rational acceptance of propositions, in its own domain. I feel that science is not responsible for any errors of scientists, either in the misconstruction of the Bible, or in offences which their share of human frailty may have led them occasionally to commit against the known laws of rational discussion. And, lastly, I am grateful both to science and to scientists for having assisted, or for having compelled, those who believe to correct errors which, in the wantonness of power, they may too long have cherished, and to submit all their claims to free and critical investigation.

The retreat from an untenable to a tenable position is in itself an unmixed good. But, given all the conditions of human feeling, thought, and action, it is an operation of invariable danger, and of mixed result. Happy they who accurately know, and who exactly realize to themselves, in the practical part of their being, what it is that they ought to abandon and what to retain, nor only to retain, but to uphold with a determination enhanced in proportion to the difficulties of the day. But in the minds of many, perhaps of the greater part, the dominant sense, at least for a time, will be that they have passed from a ground old and familiar to one new and strange; that they have parted with something, they do not quite know how much; that if they have been wrong once, they may, perhaps, be wrong again. And then it is so much easier to believe in a volume, which the hand could grasp, than to hold fast the mental conception of a Revelation conveyed in that volume. True, such a conception of God in the Bible, which may be, but ought not to have been, a new one, is strictly and solidly analogous to the familiar, and equally indispensable, conceptions of God in Nature, God in Providence, God in the Christian Church. But these we had from our cradles; they were thoroughly congenial through use. To apply the same rule to the Bible is really to integrate, rather than to disintegrate, the idea of our knowledge of God. But there is something like the discomfort of a new habiliment to be got over, and there are the taunts of the adversary to be endured.

I will not dwell at large upon other difficulties springing from the errors or the incaution of believers; but they are grave in their nature. Whenever, under the idea of magnifying the grace or favor of God, we derogate from his immutable righteousness and justice; and whenever, in exalting the unspeakable mercy of his pardon, we unhinge its inseparable alliance with a profound and penetrating moral work in the creature pardoned: then we draw down dangers upon the Christian system greater far than can ever be entailed upon it by its enemies.

But there may be worse still than this. Worse there will be, if the believer in Christ holds the doctrines without giving effect to it in his life; and worst of all if, while he holds it, he not only is betrayed into the ordinary weaknesses or excesses of human nature, but forgets also, and derides or disregards those primal sanctions of natural morality, which vice itself is not always hardened enough to discard. The constitution of the family, the ties between its members, the nature of the woman and of the man, the relation between them, and the relation of each of them to himself, to that God-given SELF, which is intrusted to every one of us to study and to revere, as well as to cleanse, to cherish, and to sanctify; these are regulated by laws the oldest, holiest, and most profound of all. Progress may be traced by its regard for them, which will decide whether it be a reality or an imposture; and Christianity itself would lose all its titles were it capable of an attempt to disturb them.

In the class of difficulties thus roughly suggested has been, as I believe, not, indeed, a legitimate, but a powerfully operative, cause for the increase of scepticism.

But the worst remains to be told. Negation is in part, and it professes and believes itself to be altogether an affair of the intellect. It proclaims, for example, that the reason why unbelief has (at the moment) so much advanced, is that dogmas like those of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Sacraments, and the future Judgment, have become insufferable to the cultivated human understanding. The conviction which possesses my mind, and which I may find it difficult to express in an unexceptionable manner, is that the main operative cause which has stimulated the growth of negation is not intellectual, but moral; and is to be found in the increased and increasing dominion of the things seen over the things unseen.

Such a proposition may at first sight appear to carry an odious meaning, Pharisaical in the worst sense of the word; a meaning which would provoke, and might justify, an angry reply. It might be interpreted as implying that the elevation of moral character in individuals varied with and according to the amount of their dogmatic belief; a proposition which in my view is untrue, offensive, and even absurd. Had I ever been inclined to such a conception, the experience of my life would long ago have undeceived me. My meaning is a very different one. I speak of that which touches not this or that man only, but us all. We have altered the standard of wants; we have multiplied the demands of appetite; we have established a new social tradition—one of those traditions which forms and guides us, apart from and antecedently to thought or choice of our own; we have created a new atmosphere, which we breathe into ourselves, and by breathing which our composition is modified unawares, according to the ingredients which that atmosphere contains. I do not say that we are the creatures of our environment, for we have power to reflect upon and to control it. But reflection and control are exercised but little in comparison with the need for them; and, in the absence of such exercise, it is the surrounding atmosphere, it is the accepted and ordinary standard, that both supplies the stock wherewith we individually begin the great adventure of the world, and that guides our life, except in the rare cases where depravity on one side, or Christian heroism on the other, causes us to adopt a separate standard for ourselves. Where both range only within the zone marked out by fashionable opinion, it is sadly easy to point out men of high virtue with little creed, and men of low virtue with much creed, in the discipline and conduct of their personal lives respectively. And, in the region of opinion, it often seems as if liberty and justice among men fared quite as well with the heterodox as with the orthodox.

A large part of these grave and even terrible anomalies is no doubt due to the fact that to each of us personally our creed has come, not with the throes of struggle, sacrifice, and strong conviction, but rather with all we hold—an easy tenure!—by descent, through others, not from ourselves; as matter of course, not of choice and effort; so that it marks us like an outward badge, rather than pervades us as a principle and a power.

But, on the other hand, how true it will be found that the sovereign tradition which has filled the air is the Christian tradition. This it is which has made possible what without it would have been wholly beyond reach. This it is which carries noiselessly into many minds and characters those opinions on behalf of virtue, of self-denial and of philanthropy, and the power of acting upon them, which are often found so honorably to distinguish creedless men. Just as many, who do not reject Christianity, know not why or how they came to hold it, so many, who have abjured Christianity, know not that in the best of their thought, their nature, and their practice, they are appropriating its fruits. What is the modern word "altruism"? As to its meaning, it is simply the second great commandment of the Christian law, which was "like unto the first." As to its form, it is merely a disguise which has been put upon a borrowed idea, so that it fails to be traced to its true original. And this not by a conscious, but, if the phrase may be pardoned, by an unconscious fraud. We find ourselves in possession of the code of Christian ethics, which has gradually pervaded life, institutions, manners, and has become so blended with our ordinary life that the memory of its divine origin has faded away, as though it were like the title-deed of an inheritance which we hold by unquestioned use. If we wish to know what the Christian tradition has done for us, we must examine the moral standard of nations who differed from us mainly in not having it. For example, we must look to the Greeks of the fifth century before Christ, or the Romans at the period of the Advent, whose moral degradation was not less conspicuous than the intellectual splendor of the one, or the constructive political genius of the other.

My twofold proposition is that we see before us an increased power of things seen, and that this increased power implies a diminishing hold upon us of things unseen. Throughout the history of mankind, the invisible, and the future which is part of the invisible, have been in standing competition with what may be termed the things of this world. There has never been a time in human history to compare with the last half-century in two vital respects: the multiplication of wealth, and the multiplication of the enjoyments which wealth procures. To take a familiar example: men (and the commodities they depend on) now travel at (say) one-fourth of the former cost, just when they have an enlargement of their means to bear the cost of travelling. True, this change has gone, to an immense extent, toward the cure of actual want, and toward extending the sphere of that sufficiency, that modest and humble comfort, which do not come within the scope of the present argument. But it has also extended largely to the spheres of leisure and of comparative affluence; and in those spheres it is generally true that the apparatus of enjoyment has been immensely developed in small things and great, that wants and appetites have grown along with it, and that if "the world was too much with us" when Wordsworth wrote his noble sonnet, it is more with us now than it was then. Obviously, almost mathematically, the increased powers of worldly attraction disturb the balance of our condition, unless and until they are compensated by increased powers of unworldly attraction and elevation. Whence are such compensating powers to be had? I am afraid we can hardly say that, in the spheres now under view there has been such a growth, in unworldly motives and ideas, as to countervail the augmented strength of worldly attachment. And I apprehend that, if the unseen world and the ideas belonging to it operate upon us with a proportionately diminished force, it follows, almost as a matter of course, that creeds, which belong to that circle of unseen associations, will be more dimly and therefore more feebly appreciated.

Materialism as a formulated system is probably not upon the increase. Those who think as I am compelled to think about the intellectual calibre of such a system, will hardly include such a growth among the objects of their apprehension. But the power of a silent, unavowed, unconscious materialism is a very different matter. I think Professor Max Müller has said that without language there cannot be thought. And this I suppose is true of all organized and conscious thought. But there are in human nature a multitude of undeveloped (so to speak) embryonic forces, of impressions received from without and finding a congenial soil within, which never make their way to maturity, or obtain a defined place in our consciousness. My belief is that at this moment these unspoken and untested, not thoughts, but rudiments of thought, are at work among us and within us, and that were they translated or expanded into words their sense would be no more nor less than the old vulgar sense of those who in all ages have held that after all this world is the only world we securely know, and that the only labor that is worth laboring, the only care worth caring, the only joy worth enjoying, are the labor, the care, the joy, that begin and end with it.

What can be more natural (in the lower sense of nature) than that among those on whom this world really smiles, together with the increasing gravitation toward a terrestrial centre, a creeping palsy should silently come over the inward life? And how easy it is to understand that, when such a palsy has set in, a new and less ungenial color is imparted to whatever undermines the written Word, or the great Christian tradition, or in whatever other way repels, or blinds and deadens, the sense of the presence of God, and the reproaches of the voice within. So that it is not either real or pretended science, nor is it even the errors and excesses of believers, illegitimately charged upon belief, that form the root of the mischief. It is the increased force within us of all which is sensuous and worldly that furnishes every sceptical argument, good, bad, or indifferent, with an unseen ally, and that recruits many a disciple of the negative teaching. He indeed dreams that by the free admission of doubt he is paying homage to truth, when in reality he is only pampering the inferior life, by allowing fresh coadjutors, with unexamined credentials, to enter and to reinforce its already overweening power. A latent conspiracy is established, and two knights ride forth together to the war, one of them fairly exhibiting his countenance, but the other with his visor on.

And the chain of cause and consequence is something like this. The Christian Creed generates a Christian tradition of idea and conduct. Of this tradition men do not disown the precepts; they only deny the parentage. And then there appears some great thinker, some really venerable man, who has learned to cherish piety while he discards dogma. The next order of operators in the field carry the work a stage farther, and cherish morality while they discard piety. And the anti-moral, anti-spiritual force, that is strong even if it be hidden in us all, using what is substantive in the work as a cover for what is destructive, looks on with complacency and swells the chorus of applause. The sceptical argument is in reality little more than a graft, set into and deriving its life and energy mainly from a tree stronger and more enduring than itself.

I must, however, in drawing these observations to a close, for a moment change my tone. In their nature apologetic, they themselves require an apology; and an apology, too, which is also in the nature of protest. They are intended to meet, so far as they go, a state of things peculiar and perhaps without example, in which multitudes of men call into question the foundations of our religion and the prerogatives of our sacred books, without any reference to either their capacity or their opportunities for so grave an undertaking. In other matters qualification must be known or shown; in religion it is taken for granted.

We have to bring equally into view, on the one side and on the other, two great propositions. On the one hand, our religion stands on the foundation of free and intelligent assent. On the other hand, every man, whatever be his position, founds, and reasonably, nay, necessarily, founds the actions and experiences of his life principally upon trust. Upon trust, no doubt, which is both intelligent and free: but still upon *trust*. Upon trust, sometimes in particular individuals, sometimes upon traditions which are in a narrower or wider sphere the traditions of his race. Every one acting a responsible part in the world, be it great or small, and be it acted with or without consciousness of its character, is continually working for others as well as for himself; is establishing and verifying on behalf of others, and in lieu of others, intellectual conclusions or material facts, which are needful for human life, but which the conditions of human life do not permit men in each case to establish and verify for themselves. Still, to establish and verify for ourselves is best. Independent knowledge is to be preferred where, and as, it can be had. The limiting law is found in capacity and in opportunity. Let us examine, where we can: where we cannot, let us refuse to seek refuge in the falsehood of a pretended examination.

But it seems to be beyond doubt that, more perhaps in these days than of old, numbers both of women and of men question the religion delivered to them from of old without or in excess of both capacity and opportunity. The turn and training of the mind, the nature of callings and pursuits, make it for some of us reasonable and necessary to put the great historic revelation on its trial, as to its evidences of fact and doctrine, and its relation to the character and condition of man. This searching process is thoroughly normal, and its application to the subject-matter, and the commonly affirmative results of its application through so many ages, have continually added force to the authority with which the Gospel lays claim to our assent and our obedience.

As to the mass of mankind, however, reason teaches that the presumption is for each man in favor of that which he has received, until he has found solid cause to question it. It is doubt, and not belief, of the things received, which ought in all cases to be put upon its defence, and to show its credentials: credentials not necessarily in terms of demonstration, but of rational likelihood. But untested doubt, which often makes a lodgment in our minds, is a dangerous and in the main an unlawful guest. It assumes unawares, and in default of examination, the attitude of demonstrated negation. It paralyzes action; it casts into the shade the sense of duty, and of the Divine presence encompassing us in all our ways; and it reduces the pulse of our moral health. Doubt may emancipate us. It may enslave us. But it must be either a friend or an enemy: it cannot be a neutral. And those doubts, which cannot be tested, ought not to be entertained as having a title to affect conduct or belief. And such inquiries as, from being inadequate, are illusory, are but fresh forms of temptation from the path of duty. Inquiry should be undertaken when it can be made the subject of effective prosecution. But if we have not the means of effective prosecution, the so-called inquiry is a pretence and an imposture; and, under its name, we become the mere victims of assumptions due to prejudice, to fashion, to propensity, to appetite, to the insidious pressure of the world-power, to temptation in every one of its Protean shapes. The universal call of man is for each to regulate his own proper conduct in his own proper sphere. A noble task for all, but an arduous task; a task so arduous that none can perform it in perfection. Duty does not require us to arrive at conclusions on

"Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute,"

much less on the yet deeper and darker speculations which lie beyond, and which, so far as they are formidable, all run up into one single, one perhaps impenetrable problem, the presence and action of evil in the world. The Christian faith and the Holy Scriptures arm us with the means of neutralizing and repelling the assaults of evil in and from ourselves. That is a practical answer. Mist may rest upon the surrounding landscape, but our own path is visible from hour to hour, from day to day.

"I do not ask to see
The distant scene; one step enough for me."

Speculation, which is purposeless, becomes irreverent; and irreverent speculation on the doings and designs of God, by those who believe in him, is itself a sin. To leave the duty of governing conduct, to which every one of us is called, for other functions to which we are not called, unless the power of following them effectually proves our vocation for the work, is morally to pass from food to famine. It is as if one who possesses a piece or two of crockery full of cracks, should announce that he desires to give a sumptuous banquet to the neighborhood.

But besides acknowledging that the proper preconditions of legitimate inquiry are adequate capacity and adequate opportunity, and deploring the course of those who treat naked and unreasoned doubt as casting a burden of proof upon belief, we must bear in mind that religious inquiry, though it may raise conflicting issues, is not like a suit between parties who meet upon equal terms, or the conflict of emperors warring for a territory in dispute. Our Saviour astonished the people because, instead of being lost in the mazes of arbitrary and vicious excrescences that darkened the face of religion, he taught them "with authority, and not as the scribes." Taught them with authority, that is to say, with the title to command, and with the force of command. If God has given us a revelation of his will, whether in the laws of our nature, or in a kingdom of grace, that revelation not only illuminates, but binds. Like the credentials of an earthly ambassador, it is just and necessary that the credentials of that revelation should be tested. But if it be found genuine, if we have proofs of its being genuine equal to those of which in the ordinary concerns of life reason acknowledges the obligatory character, then we find ourselves to be not independent beings engaged in an optional inquiry, but the servants of a Master, the pupils of a Teacher, the children of a Father, and each of us already bound with the bonds which those relations imply; then head and knee must bow before the Eternal, and the Divine will must be embraced and followed by man with all his heart, with all his mind, with all his soul, and with all his strength.

I have yet more one closing word. I have desired to make this humble offering at the shrine of Christian belief in general, and have sought wholly to avoid the questions which concern this or that particular form of it. For there is a common cause, which warrants and requires common efforts. Far be from me the intention hereby to undervalue particular beliefs. I have not intentionally said a word to disparage them. It will in my view be an evil day, and a day of calamity, when men are tempted, even by the vision of a holy object, to abate, in any region or in the smallest fraction, the authority of conscience, or to forget that the supreme title and the supreme efficacy of truth lie in its integrity.

London, England.

THE MINISTRY REQUIRED BY THE AGE.*

BY R. W. DALE, LL.D.

From *The British Weekly* (Nonconformist), London, November 13, 1890.

II.

BUT I suppose that when I was asked to speak of the ministry required by the present age, it was intended that I should say something of the way in which the ministry should be affected by the present condition of the *Church* itself—its intellectual, ethical, and spiritual condition. An impossible subject! I approach it with despair; but I say again I must do what I can.

THEOLOGICAL TRANSITION.

(1) First of all, I think that you should wish your minister to recognize very frankly that immense intellectual movement in which all the Churches of the West have been involved since the Renaissance of the fifteenth century and the Reformation of the sixteenth. It has affected the theology of the Church of Rome as well as of the Protestant Churches. In the Protestant Churches there came a very powerful reaction, in the course of two or three generations after the great revolt against the Roman authority; but very soon the tide turned again, and it has been flowing—with some checks—ever since. The Protestant attempt to recast theological thought in scholastic forms has broken down. It had broken down before your time and mine. The Evangelical Revival of the last century was one of the forces which contributed to break it down. Forty—thirty years ago, perhaps later—there were men among us who exhorted us to be faithful to the theology of the Puritans, and by the Puritans they meant the Calvinistic Puritans; but these very men, though they were hardly conscious of it, had travelled very far from the position of the Puritan theologians. For good or for evil—partly, as I think, for both—they had ceased to hold the Puritan faith. Compare the Declaration of Faith and Order which was accepted by the ministers and representatives of the Congregational Churches of England and Wales in 1833—nearly sixty years ago—with the Westminster Confession; or compare it with the Declaration agreed upon by the elders and messengers of the Congregational Churches in England who met at the Savoy just after the death of Cromwell, which was substantially identical with the Westminster Confession, and you will see how immense was the transition from the theology of the Puritans to the theology of our immediate ecclesiastical ancestors. The elaborate and stately system of theological belief which had been created by the theologians of the Reformed Church, of whom Francis Turretin is the best representative, has been sinking into decay for two centuries. And, as yet, no other organized theological system has taken its place.

That seems to me a great evil. For it shows that we have no intellectual expression of the contents of faith which satisfies us, or which even approximately satisfies us. There are many who regard this condition of things with exultation. They triumph in their freedom. They seem to imagine that they are displaying heroic courage in insulting and trampling under foot traditional creeds. There is no heroic courage in *that.* I see the ruins of a fortress, stern and mighty in other centuries, but tenantless for generations; it shows the traces of successful siege; it has been wasted by wind and rain and frost, and long neglect; the strong men, with nerves and muscles, as well as armor, of iron, who once held it against hostile armies, have long since turned to dust; the roof has fallen in; the walls are rent; many of its stones have been carried off by the neighbors to build, not another fortress, but very humble homes to shelter them from the weather. The men who assaulted it in its strength must have had courage; the people who are mocking at the ancient garrison and are dancing triumphantly in the grass-covered courtyard, require none.

Indeed the mocking and the dancing are rather frivolous occupations. Would it not be well, instead of dwelling very much more on the decay of old forms of theological belief, to attempt to construct new? While the intellect has no part, or very little part, in the religious life, the religious life will never have in it the elements of enduring vigour. The work of reconstruction must, I think, be done piece by piece. We may be satisfied if in a generation we make one or two great doctrines clearer and are able to define them with more precision. Our methods may as yet be imperfect; but we shall not be wise to wait till they are perfected; by putting them into practice we shall discover their defects and shall gradually amend them.

A strong intellectual conception of the

---

* The first part was reprinted in the December number of this MAGAZINE, pp. 200–204.

great truths of the Christian faith is a real aid to the moral and religious life. Where thought is vague, character is likely to be feeble. And do not be misled by the popular cry against the tyranny of exact theological thinking. Our present doctrinal controversies are, for the most part, not about the definitions of transcendent truths, but about the transcendent truths themselves. Definitions may be necessary in order to make the real issue clear. Athanasius defined because the Arians shuffled.

You should, in my judgment, wish your minister's preaching to be instructive. You should wish him to teach you something—something clear and definite—something that may not, indeed, be a final statement of the truth, for no statement of the truth can be final—but something which shall be sufficiently near the eternal fact for which it stands to serve you and to last your time.

The old maps of the country may be more or less inaccurate; they may have become untrustworthy; but this is generally acknowledged, and nothing is to be gained by further attacks on them; give us another map that shall more truly represent the outlines of the coast, the lay of the mountains, the course of the rivers; if you can only give us a fairly accurate map of a single district, that will be more to the purpose now than your demonstration of the untrustworthiness of the old maps of the continent. It is always easy to interest large numbers of people in attacks upon the beliefs of other people; try to create in this congregation a general and earnest desire to learn what you should believe yourselves. To people who have never had, or who have lost, the faculty for clear thinking, and to people who will not take the trouble to think, an instructive preacher will sometimes be dull; let your minister know that you like him to be dull in that way—at least now and then. Encourage him to respect the rights of the intellect; do not ask him always to preach sermons which can be understood by everybody, and understood without effort. As long as men are unwilling to serve God with their understanding, they withhold from Him half His claims.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

You will probably expect your minister to discuss, now and then, the questions which have been raised concerning the dates and authorship of the books of Holy Scripture. In a congregation like this it is hardly possible for him to pass them over. As far as the books of the New Testament are concerned, I think that we are within sight of the practical close of the controversy. After a century of struggle the historical trustworthiness of the Four Gospels and the genuineness of, at least, all the important epistles are secure. But with regard to the earlier books of the Old Testament—their sources and the times at which they received their present form—the battle is at its height. He would be a rash man, I think, who ventured just now to speak with absolute confidence on some of the questions under debate. Do not be alarmed if you find that your minister is uncertain about them—if he speaks with hesitation, if he declines to commit himself to a definite judgment. I cannot doubt that the issue of this controversy will, in any case, be to enlarge and exalt our conceptions of the method of divine revelation; but the good which is certain to come of it will be immensely increased if, while it lasts, you and all other churches wait patiently for its final results, and see clearly that no uncertainties with regard to investigations of this kind should lessen the strength or diminish the joy of your own consciousness that in Christ you have been restored to God.

(2) But it is certain that while our doctrinal uncertainties last, and while the debate on the literary and historical questions relating to our sacred books is still going on, there is serious peril to the spiritual life. I will not at this moment attempt to determine whether the peril is greater than that which has to be reckoned with when the Church is disturbed by no serious intellectual conflicts. It is enough for us to consider our own dangers.

There are large numbers of people in our churches whose chief intellectual interests—I mean their chief intellectual interests in religion—lie remote from the central truths of the Christian Gospel. They are deeply concerned, for example, in questions about the future of those who in this world are impenitent—a question, no doubt, of immense importance, but one on which they will never reach a right conclusion, except by accident, as long as they have no corresponding intellectual interest in *all* the main truths which are implicated in the Incarnation of Christ and His death for the sins of the world. Others, again, are chiefly interested in literary, historical, or scientific questions relating to the Old Testament: these, too, are questions important in their place. But this diversion of intellectual and even moral interest from the central facts of the revelation of God in Christ—this absorption in a special set of questions, some of which are purely speculative and are remote from life and practice—is a grave evil, and must be taken into account by the minister.

You should wish him to speak, not merely on those subjects upon which you are always thinking and reading and talking, but on those great things about which you think very little; and you should wish him to speak of them in a manner that will, through God's grace, give them their right place in your thought and life. You should wish him to speak of these forgotten truths, not as a theologian, but as a minister of Christ; of the Incarnation, not so as to enable you to construct a theory about the limitations of our Lord's knowledge or His real accessibility to temptation, but so as to fill you with awe and wonder in the presence of the actual assumption of human nature and human life by the Eternal Son of God; of His sufferings and death, not so as to resolve hard questions about the theory of the Atonement, but so as to bring home to you the greatness of the redemption which His sufferings and death achieved for mankind; for in Christ "we have our redemption through the blood," and His blood was shed "unto remission of sins." You should wish your minister to make real to you, by God's grace, Paul's exultation in being "justified by faith"—the boundless joy, the new vigour, the large freedom which came to Christian men when that great truth, covered for centuries with thick clouds, shone out once more in its old splendour at the Reformation. You should wish him so to speak of Christ that you may know for yourselves that He who died is alive again and liveth forevermore; of the Spirit of God, that you may be able to bear witness, on the strength of your own experience, that He has come to the Church, and that He abides with it forever.

THE LOSS OF THE TRADITIONAL METHOD OF LIFE.

(3) Finally, there is a great deal in the ethical and religious life of the churches of our times which requires special and serious treatment by the Christian ministry. We have escaped from the power of tradition, not only in our theological thought, but in our personal habits and in the order of our homes. This freedom, like the theological freedom, is also spoken of by many persons with exultation, as though it were altogether a good thing, and had no evil in it.

That the tradition of conduct was outworn—that its passing away was, therefore, inevitable—is no doubt true. But this is our misfortune; we have no reason for rejoicing in it. It is an immense loss not to inherit by birth a method of life; for this means that the experience of past generations conveys no guidance to us as to the conduct and habits which contribute to form an ideal Christian character. It means that we have to begin afresh and to learn everything for ourselves. It is like being born into a country in which there are no roads, and in which we have to discover by exploration how to get from one point to another. Even after the exploration the roads have to be made, if we are to travel safely and easily. Human life is so complex that in the absence of definite traditions how it should be ordered, we are sure to make the gravest mistakes, and in the individual life the mistakes can never be remedied. If parents, for example, inherit no tradition as to the best way of ordering the lives of their children, they are sure—even the wisest of them—to go wrong, and to go wrong on some very important points; and the injury which their children suffer is permanent: it cannot be undone. If young men and women form habits which experience shows them to be injurious—and they are likely to form such habits ignorantly unless a wise tradition of conduct has great moral authority over the people with whom they live—the habits, even if at last they are broken, have permanently affected the power and grace of character.

We had a traditional method of life at one time; indeed, we had it within the memory of many people now living; but it has disappeared; and now every man does what is right in his own eyes. We have the Sermon on the Mount; but the application of the Sermon on the Mount to the details of conduct is difficult. The old method had become hard, mechanical, artificial; but still it was a method, and it contained—though in a half-fossilized form—the results of the experience of several generations of devout Christian men and women.

For example, the traditional method of life gave us a certain conception of Sunday, and of how Sunday should be kept; how often we should attend public worship; what kind of books we should read at home; what occupations were lawful on Sunday, what were unlawful, to a Christian man. The old method has gone. Every man has now to find out for himself how it is best to keep Sunday; at present I do not think that the general results of the experiment can be regarded with satisfaction.

Take another example: Within the memory of many of us, works of fiction were peremptorily excluded from the homes of large numbers of Congregationalists. To read a novel was a mark of unregeneracy. I remember very well preaching a sermon in which I incidentally defended novel reading; it was in the early days of my ministry, and it greatly troubled some of the older members of my congregation—venerable, saintly men and women, whom I *often* troubled, but who showed great generosity and magnanimity in their treatment of me. Now, young and old, we are all reading novels. But at a church meeting at Carrs Lane, held a fortnight or three weeks ago for conference on the hindrances to Christian living, I read a letter from one of the members—for we allow those to write who shrink from speaking—in which the writer said that for nineteen years her passion for works of fiction had been one of her greatest hindrances; that she had fought hard with it, but was not even now sure that it was finally mastered. And there can be no doubt that excessive novel reading has an effect upon the moral and religious life analogous to that of excessive drinking: it weakens moral fibre, makes the will irresolute, destroys self-restraint, renders impossible many of the nobler virtues.

Take another example: The old method of life forbade a large number of amusements which we regard as innocent; and we scoff at its irrational rigidity. But at another church conference held a week later than that to which I have just referred, we had a conversation on the interest of the Church in Missions; and in a letter from another member of the church, it was said that thirty years ago our young people were very generally interested in Foreign Missions, but that now large numbers of them are so occupied with lawn-tennis and other out-door amusements in summer, and with pursuits of other kinds in winter, that they have neither the time nor the disposition to read about Missions or to care for them

The old method of life, I repeat, cannot be defended. It declared many things to be wrong in themselves which are right in themselves. It was technical, external. It reminds me of the rabbinical interpretations of the Fourth Commandment. It is a sin, the rabbis argued, to work on the Sabbath; to lift and to carry a heavy burden—a burden weighing a hundred-weight, to use modern terms—is to work, and therefore is a sin; but to lift and to carry a burden weighing ten pounds less than a hundred-weight is also a sin, for a few pounds in the weight of a burden cannot make any difference in the morality of carrying it; and to lift and to carry a still lighter burden is also a sin; and at last they concluded that it was a sin to pick up and carry a piece of string. And some of the severer interpreters of the law maintained that since all work is muscular exertion, there should be no muscular exertion of any kind on the Sabbath—a case of "undistributed middle"—and that to keep the commandment perfectly a man should remain absolutely motionless through the whole of its twenty-four hours. The method of life which was once authoritative among us had this technical rabbinical character. You ought not to make a shirt on Sunday; therefore, you ought not to sew on a button.

And yet there was more of philosophy than we sometimes suppose in those rigid rules, which absolutely forbade any common work on the Sunday, and the writing of letters, and the reading of newspapers and "secular" books: declared all novels contraband; and condemned all exciting amusements. Things which are innocent, perhaps helpful, in moderation, are ruin and death in excess. The old method of life rested upon the same principle that is the reasonable ground of the Total Abstinence movement in our own times; to large numbers of persons total abstinence is easy—total abstinence from beer and spirits and wine—from billiards, from dancing, from novels, from occupations on Sunday which are not strictly religious—but moderation is difficult. Our fathers insisted on total abstinence.

Apart from these definite and rigid rules, the whole conception of life which was traditional among us till within recent years was different from our own. Our strength has always been largely derived from the merchants, manufacturers, and prosperous tradesmen in the great towns and cities of the kingdom; and I think that, as a rule, in the early part of this century a merchant, a manufacturer, or a tradesman, who was a member of a Congregational Church, was quite satisfied to live in a smaller house than a merchant, manufacturer, or tradesman with the same income, who was what he would call "a man of the world;" he had less "glass" in his grounds; he kept fewer servants and fewer horses and carriages; he gave less costly entertainments. His whole way of living was simpler. There was a larger margin between his income and expenditure. There was a certain restraint upon indulgence in the pleasant things which were within his reach. All this came from a traditional theory—not perhaps very exactly defined—of the difference between the Christian and the worldly life. The theory has disappeared, and with the theory the practice. The very word "worldly" has almost ceased to be used. "Old times are changed; old manners gone;" and it might be worth while to consider whether the change is altogether for the better.

In literature a certain self-restraint, a pruning of a too luxurious growth of imagery and style, is necessary to perfection; in every form of art—in painting, sculpture, architecture—the decline from the nobleness and grace of the great masters begins with the relaxation of this restraint; and a similar relaxation is followed by the corruption of eloquence and its degradation to a worthless and pernicious rhetoric. And so in the conduct of life a certain moderation, a voluntary limitation of expenditure and enjoyment, is the condition of power and grace and dignity. Under even the silken robe there should be the leathern girdle. It is not the "body" merely which has to be kept under if we are not to be castaways. The old method of life has disappeared. Is it not time for congregations to ask their ministers to assist them in constructing a new method, wiser and better than the old? for a new method is urgently needed.

The Christian ideal of life and conduct in this present century—what is it? The Christian ideal on the exchange, in the mill, in the workshop, in the counting-house, in Parliament, in the City Council, in the home—what is it? The Christian ideal for the employer, the Christian ideal for the employed—what is it? The old ways are out of repair, going to ruin; it is time to make strraight paths for our feet.

To construct the Christian ideal of life and conduct we must be filled with the Spirit of God, must live under the full power of that transcendent revelation which has come to us through Christ, and in the conscious possession of that redemption which He achieved for the human race, once for all, by His Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection. We must see and know for ourselves that He has made all things new; that we are living in a new earth and under new heavens. Eternal things must enter into the solution of the problems of the hour. In determining how we are to live we must remember, first of all, what we are—children of God redeemed by Christ, destined to an endless life of righteousness, wisdom, blessedness, and glory, and that we have to make our calling and election sure.

And so in this age, as in all past ages, the ministry which the Church supremely requires is a ministry filled with awe and strength and tenderness by the immediate vision of God in Christ. And this is the ministry which is also supremely required by the world. If we know God in Christ for ourselves, men will listen to us with confidence when we tell them that they too may have redemption through the blood of Christ, even the forgiveness of sins, and that through Him they may share the life and the joy of God.

IS THERE A ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH?

BY HENRY CHARLES LEA.

From *The Independent*, New York, November 27, 1890.

(Continued from the December number.)

II.

The validity of all sacraments, as we have seen in the previous article, depends not only on the good faith of the minister but also upon his mental condition during the ceremony, two wholly unknown and undiscoverable factors. When once this conclusion was reached there was opened a boundless field of speculation as to the infinite varieties of mental processes which still further complicated the already hopelessly tangled question. All theologians agreed that virtual intention suffices, but the definition of virtual intention was no easy matter in practice. Scotus, Suarez and Vasquez frame one definition, Coninch another, Lugo and Dicastillo another; all these are authorities of the first rank, and the shrewd Jesuit Viva, who reports them, wisely declines to decide between them.* Then the fact that the priest may have two intentions gives rise to many nice distinctions; the more powerful of the two is held to be the determining one; but if they are successive the later, unless the earlier had rendered void all subsequent ones; in any case, if there is doubt concerning them the validity of the sacrament is doubtful.† An explicit intention of making the sacrament is not essential, for if a man intends to do what the Church does this is sufficient, even if he does not believe in the sacrament; thus the heretic can baptize even if he laughs at the doctrine that baptism is a sacrament and does not wish to do what the Roman Church does; for he wishes to do what

---

* Viva, Theologica Trutina, *ubi sup.*

† Liguori, Theol. Moral., Lib. VI, n, 24.

Christ commanded, and this prevails over his error in thinking his own Church the true one. But if the celebrant believes that an explicit intention is necessary and he has not such explicit intention, then he does not administer a valid sacrament.[*] These examples will suffice to show how dangerous was the question which involved such subtile metaphysical distinctions, and only became more complicated and doubtful the more it came to be elucidated.

There were a few theologians sufficiently alive to the uncertainty thus cast on all the ministrations of the Church to seek for some mitigation of the Tridentine canon. The learned Dominican, Ambrogio Caterino, was a member of the Council and vigorously opposed its decision, pointing out the desolation which a wicked or infidel priest might spread among the faithful by withholding his intention and thus rendering invalid the baptism of those who might afterward rise to high places in the Church, all of whose ordinations and other acts would be nugatory; it was no answer to say that such cases were rare, for in that corrupt age they were frequent. In spite of his protests the canon was adopted; but his sense of impending evils was so strong that he soon afterward, in 1552, wrote a tract "*De Intentione Ministri*," to prove that the only intention requisite was that of performing the external rite without reference to the internal mental operation.[†] Though Caterino was eventually promoted to the archbishopric of Conza, his argument reduced the Tridentine definition to so absurd a nullity that it found no favor and was speedily forgotten. In the next century, however, it was revived by Joseph Maria Scribonius, a Frenchman, who labored to show that it had not been condemned at Trent, and he was followed by several others, mostly of the same nationality, such as Salmeron, Contenson, Bossuet, Serry and Juenin.[‡] At length the Holy See felt it necessary to put an end to these speculations, and in a list of errors condemned by Alexander VIII., December 7th, 1690, was the one of maintaining that baptism is valid, even if the ministrant declares internally that it is not his intention to do what the Church does. Under pain of *ipso-facto* excommunication, removable only by the Pope, even the discussion of this proposition was forbidden, except to attack it.[*] Since this emphatic warning there has been little dissidence of opinion. The learned Benedict XIV., it is true, unofficially stated that there had been no express definition by the Holy See as to the manner in which God regards the question; but as the common opinion of theologians requires actual or virtual intention, that opinion is always to be followed in practice, yet bishops ought not to condemn the other side.[†] The leading modern authorities, however, are unequivocal in their assertion of the necessity of intention. La Croix even holds that not only intention but attention is requisite, and that distraction on the part of the priest invalidates the sacrament, but he stands alone in this.[‡]

Yet one kindly exception has been made in deference to the needs of human society. As the social organization is built upon the family, and as matrimony is a sacrament, it would be too great a demand upon the obedience of the faithful to inflict upon all married persons the torturing doubt as to whether they are living in concubinage and whether their children are illegitimate, in consequence of the unknown and impenetrable mental condition of the minister officiating at their nuptials. The theologians, therefore, for the most part have mercifully discovered that in matrimony the real ministers of the sacrament are the contracting parties themselves and not the priest. It is true that some great authorities, including Melchor Cano, deny this; but the mass of Catholic doctors, represented by the supreme name of Alphonso Liguori, decide in favor of the sacramental character of the action of the bride and groom, so that the uncertainty which hangs over the administration of all other sacraments need not cast a shadow over the households of the faithful.[§] Yet, after all, this only transfers the doubt from the priest to the contracting parties, for their intention thus becomes necessary to the validity of the sacrament, and this gives rise to a further endless series of questions on which the authorities are by no means agreed. The common opinion is that intention is sufficiently to be inferred if the man expresses consent and the woman holds out her hand to him.[‖] This, however, is far from settling the matter, for the consent may have been given under misapprehension or through deceit, rendering the contract a virtually conditional one in which the condition is not fulfilled, and there is thus no real intention. It would be useless to follow the theologians through their interminable debates as to the precise degree of error necessary to invalidate a marriage, or to review the nice distinctions drawn and the conflict of authorities which perplex the matter until the attempt to lay down rules for guidance only renders it more difficult of solution.[*] The practical import of all this was illustrated, about a fortnight since, in a Philadelphia tribunal, where there was an effort to break a marriage between a Catholic girl and a Jew. Father Dressmann brought his authorities into court and argued that the bride had been deceived as to the religion of the groom and therefore there had been no marriage. "It was not the intention," he said, "of Anna Eichert to be married to a Jew; it was not her intention to be married to the son of the old Steins; the mutual consent on her part was wanting."[†] If his facts were true he was perfectly correct, according to the doctrines of the theologians; but it would be a misfortune for society if every disillusioned husband and wife were to seek thus to prove the nullity of an ill-assorted marriage.

---

[*] Liguori, Theol. Moral., Lib. VI, 22, 25.

[†] Sarpi, Hist. del Conc. Trident, Lib. II (Ed. Helmstadt I, 224).—Bened. PP, XIV. De Synodo Diœces., Lib. VII, c, iv, n, 6.

[‡] Viva, Theologica Trutina, *ubi sup.*—Benedict. PP, XIV, De Synodo Diœces., Lib. VII, c. iv, n, 6—Liguori Theol. Moral., Lib. VI, n, 23.—Addis and Arnold, Catholic Dictionary, *s. v.*, Sacraments of the Gospel, § 5.

[*] Alex. PP, VIII, Constit. *Pro pastorali cura*, Prop. 28 (Bullar, Rom. T., XII, p. 67).

[†] Bened., PP, XIV, De Synodo Diœc., Lib. VII, c. iv, n, 9.

[‡] Ferraris, *s. v.*, *Intentio*, n, 23.—Liguori, Lib. VI, n, 1, 13, 14. Sanchez, Prontuario de la Theologia Moral, Trat. I, Punto iv, §§ 2, 5, 6.

[§] Melchor, Cani de Locis Theolog., Lib. VIII, c. 5.—S. Alph. Liguori Theol. Moral., Lib. VI, n, 897. Sanchez, Prontuario, Trat. 1, Punto iv, § 1, n, 2.

[‖] Liguori, Lib. VI, n, 889.

Having thus established the necessity of the intention of the ministrant to the validity of the sacraments, the Church must accept the results, even if they lead to its self-extinction. It would be difficult indeed to limit the consequences of the position to which it has been driven in its contests with the heretics. As the doctrine of intention is a matter of faith, it is part of the economy of the universe, and has existed from the beginning, not merely since the thirteenth century, when it was discovered, but since the period of the Apostles. There are, therefore, twelve centuries during which the ignorance of it must have led to innumerable baptisms and ordinations which were invalid and void. Even after its recognition no one cognizant of the weakness of human nature or familiar with the perpetually recurring denunciations of clerical corruption can doubt that, at least until recent times, the Church has been full of reckless, careless and perverse priests, whose ministrations have been void through ignorance and indolence, if not through malice or infidelity, and of bishops whose worldliness rendered the performance of their office a mere perfunctory duty. Since the outbreak of the Reformation, moreover, there have been thousands of apostates, who before openly leaving the Church may have desired to harm it as much as possible. The effect of all this has been twofold. As regards the faithful themselves, it would be impossible to compute the millions who have been consigned to the eternal torments of Hell, either through failure to enjoy valid baptism, and thus to become Christians, or through failure to obtain valid absolution, on which they have relied for the pardon of their sins. This has not only resulted from lack of due intention on the part of the ministrants of the sacraments, but from the fact that there has been a steadily increasing number of ecclesiastics whose defective ordination has precluded them from administering any valid sacraments save baptism.

This latter is, perhaps, the most serious aspect of the doctrine, as it may vitiate the whole organization of the Church. Of the myriads whose baptism has been invalid great numbers have unquestionably entered the Church, although in reality incapacitated from ordination; and to these are to be added those whose ordination by careless bishops has been defective. Any of these who have reached the episcopal rank have been incapable of conferring valid ordination; and those to whom they have administered the sacrament of orders have not been really priests. Such a source of infection spreads incomputably; for every unbaptized or imperfectly ordained priest who becomes a bishop becomes also a new centre whence the impalpable and invisible virus extends on all sides. It is, therefore, uncertain to-day whether any priest is really a priest; and it is among the possibilities that from the Pope down there is not one who is actually in orders and in possession of the supernatural powers which he claims to exercise. Thus take the venerable Leo XIII. If in the interminable line of his spiritual ancestry there has been a single one whose ordination was thus vitiated, Leo is not really in orders, and all his acts are invalid. Or if this has happened to any former Pope, his creations of cardinals have been void, and subsequent Popes have been elected by a hopelessly unlawful body. No man can tell whether the whole organization of the Church may not be fatally "irregular," and whether there has been for centuries a real successor to St. Peter. It is, therefore, a fair subject for speculation whether by this time the Church has not extinguished itself.

---

[*] Liguori, Lib. vi, n, 1012–23.

[†] In this case the learned judge refused to accept the Catholic view, and informed the bride: "By the law of God your marriage was not null and void. . . . By the law of the land you are irrevocably bound to him;" and on his instructing her that she was free to go with her husband, she joyfully did so.

There have not been wanting those who from time to time have called attention to some of these consequences of the dogma, and the attempts made to answer them show their arguments to be unanswerable. Hardly had the doctrine been formulated and established when its opponents pointed out that no one could tell whether a priest was really a priest. All that Durand de Saint Pourçain can advance in reply to this is to dismiss it as frivolous, because you cannot expect to have certainty in everything.* When Caterino urged the same argument fruitlessly on the Fathers of Trent, Cardinal Pallavicino makes a labored effort to refute him by pointing out that lack of intention is not the only danger which we incur in the sacraments, for a wicked priest can nullify them by omitting necessary words—thus admitting the danger and multiplying it—and that we must rely on Providence to guide the hearts of men or avert the evil in some unknown manner; besides, men cannot complain if they fail of salvation, for they are unworthy of it, and perhaps God may supply what is lacking in the act of the priest—all of which confesses that the only way to escape the consequences of the doctrine is to abandon it.† Willem van Est, one of the soundest and sanest theologians of the seventeenth century, satisfies himself with assuring the faithful that they must be content with what he assumes to be moral certainty and not trouble themselves about possibilities.‡ Ferraris meets the argument that it is contrary to the goodness of God that infants or contrite sinners should be damned through the malice of a priest by coolly remarking that they are damned for their sins, original or actual; there is no defect in God's goodness, who has provided the means of salvation, and he is not bound, even if he could, to impede the malice of the minister.§ All this shows that the Church admits the consequences of the position taken at Trent, but is unable to devise a remedy.

Yet I do not for a moment suppose that Leo XIII. entertains the slightest doubt as to the validity of his claim to act as the Vicegerent of Christ, or that the faithful in general allow their equanimity to be disturbed as to the efficacy of the sacraments administered to them, save in the rare cases when a priest abandons the Church and his recent penitents feel it incumbent on them to repeat their confessions and obtain absolution *ad cautelam*. Nevertheless, the subject is not without interest as an illustration of the imbecility of man when he attempts to control the infinite and arrogates to himself a portion of God's power without sharing God's omniscience.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

---

* Durand. de S. Portiano Comment. super Sententt. Lib. IV, Dist. xix, Q. 2, § 7.

† Pallavicini Hist. C. Trident, IX, vj, 4-6.

‡ Estius in Lib. IV, Sententt. Dist. 1, § 24.

§ Ferraris, Prompta Bibl. *s. v. Intentio*, n, 30.

I.

MODERN EXAGGERATIONS OF THE DIVINE IMMANENCE.

BY PRESIDENT AUGUSTUS H. STRONG, D.D.

From *The Examiner* (Baptist), New York, December 4 and 11, 1890.

EVERY great system of error has in it a grain of truth, and it is this truth, rather than the falsehood mingled with it, that gives the system its hold and power among men. This is what Frederick W. Robertson meant when he spoke of "the soul of good in things evil." The single good kernel is buried in a heap of chaff; but we must find and set aside the good before we can deprive the evil of its seeming weight and influence. It is the immeasurable distinction of Christianity and the proof of its divine origin that it not only contains all these grains of truth which give power to other systems, but presents them in clear and exalted forms without the slightest admixture of error.

EXCLUSIVE TRANSCENDENCE IS DEISM.

There are two great truths of Scripture and of theology which are essential to our conception of God: the truth of God's immanence, on the one hand, and the truth of God's transcendence on the other. They are mutually complementary hemispheres in our rounded globe of doctrine; like the pillars Jachin and Boaz, they are twin wardens of the sanctuary. But either one of them, taken by itself to the exclusion of the other, may become a great error. A half truth is a whole falsehood. The English deism of the seventeenth century was simply an exaggeration of the truth of the divine transcendence. It had influence even upon subsequent defenders of the faith. Christian apologists, such as Paley, conceived of God as a workman who lives outside of his work, like the watchmaker who makes the watch, but sells it to the owner; like the shipwright who launches the ship, but commits it to the sailors. Such doctrine wrought incidental harm to theology and merited the scornful characterization of Carlyle: "An absentee God, sitting idle ever since the first Sabbath at the outside of the universe and seeing it go."

Yet it would be wrong to say that the opposite truth of God's immanence has ever been lost out of the experience of the church. The presence of God in nature, the consciousness of which gives such a warmth and glow to the 104th Psalm, has its counterpart in the experience of every New Testament believer. The indwelling of a divine Redeemer in the heart has been a part of the Christian consciousness ever since Christianity began—in fact, "Christ in you, the hope of glory," is the very essence of the Christian religion. God's indwelling is a truth without which no true religion is possible; and Augustine, who has been accused of ignoring it, has left to the world no more famous saying than that in which he recognizes it: "O God, thou hast made us for thyself, and our heart is restless till it find rest in thee!"

EXCLUSIVE IMMANENCE IS PANTHEISM.

As deism is an exaggeration of the truth of divine transcendence, so pantheism is an exaggeration of the truth of divine immanence. Its plausibility and attraction consist in this, that it continually emphasizes and exclusively inculcates God's universal and perpetual abiding in the things and the beings he has made. The error of pantheism is that it holds to God's immanence alone, and makes this an exhaustive expression of the truth. The truth of God's immanence needs to be qualified by the truth of God's transcendence. And this the Scripture does. There we read of "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." There is the truth of pantheism—God is "through all and in you all." But then the apostle who writes these words shows the incalculable superiority of Christianity to pantheism, by putting in the forefront the truth of which pantheism never dreamed. Before he speaks of God as "through all, and in you all," he speaks of God as "above all." Now, we have a basis for immanence, in the transcendent existence of God. Before the world, and outside the world, God is, forevermore.

In the great pendulum-swing of human thought, this last truth of God's transcendence is now coming to be ignored. We live in a time of pantheistic tendencies, and all our literature is affected by them. As Paley was unconsciously influenced by the very deism which he attacked, so many Christian thinkers of the present day are powerfully influenced by the pantheism with which they intend to be at war. They dwell upon God's immanence, to the exclusion of God's transcendence. They so merge him in the universe, that the personal and living God is in danger of being lost sight of. It will be of service to consider this exaggeration of the divine immanence, and to point out the perils to which it is exposed. In this first article, I propose to notice certain tenets by which it is characterized. In a second article, I shall attempt to furnish the antidote, by calling attention to facts which refute it.

CONTINUOUS CREATION VS. CREATION.

This method of thought substitutes, for creation, the idea of continuous creation. It denies that there ever was any real beginning of the universe. God has always been creating, and he is creating still. Creation is a continual necessity, because no single thing in the universe has any independent existence or power. The moon in the sky does not owe its existence at this moment to the fact that it existed a moment ago—God must at each successive instant create it over again. Even God cannot make anything that shall last a moment after he has created it.

Now it is true that science cannot tell us of beginnings—it only records changes. Geology, as has been well said, is the autobiography of the earth; no autobiography can tell the story of its author's birth; and geology cannot tell how the world first came into being. But what science cannot do, revelation does do; the problem before which science stands petrified, as by the stare of a Gorgon, Scripture solves: "By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which do appear." How significant it is that the very first word of the Bible is one that asserts, over against this false doctrine that God is only in the world, the great truth that God existed before the world, that creation is not a series of acts without beginning, that the entire universe had a beginning, that this beginning was due to God: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." How significant it is that the Sabbath day has been established as a perpetual monument to God's creative activity, so that Sabbath bells and Sabbath worship are ever recurring divine testimonies to God's transcendence, to the fact that he is above the world as well as in it, to the fact that "heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain him."

EVOLUTION VS. PROVIDENCE.

This method of thought substitutes, for God's providence, a merely natural evolution. It will not grant that there are any second causes in nature. All is the direct work of God, and God works only in lines of reguar development.

Now we grant that there was a time when too much was ascribed to mere external fiat, and too little to natural growth. But this was not the fault of Scripture, it was the fault of man's short-sighted interpretations of Scripture. The Bible recognizes development: the earth brings forth, the tree yields fruit whose seed is in itself, and man is fruitful and multiplies. But the account in Genesis is not only prefaced by the originating act of God, it is supplemented by successive manifestations of creative power in the introduction of brute and of human life. Here, too, Scripture gives an answer to questions which science cannot solve. Along the line of development there are breaks which science cannot fill. How could the organic come from the inorganic, the vegetable from the stone or the clod? Science cannot tell us. How did the animal originate from the plant? Science is silent. Did man come from the brute? Science cannot prove it; the links are missing. Can Christ be explained as a natural evolution from the Pharisees and Sadducees? Was Paul, the apostle, only a natural outgrowth from Saul, the persecutor? Who does not see that these gaps in the line of development need to be filled in by new-creating activities of God; that they prove the existence of a God above nature, as well as in nature; that they witness to God's transcendence, as well as to his immanence?

NATURAL LAW VS. MIRACLES AND INSPIRATION.

This method of thought would substitute, for miracles and inspiration, a God who works only through natural law. We are asked whether the daily miracle of the sunrise and the sunset is not better than sporadic exhibitions of divine power. No, we reply, not if sin blinds men to the presence of God in these uniformities of nature. The dull heart needs special proofs of God's power and special communications of his love. To say that everything is miracle, is simply to say that nothing is miracle. To say that everybody is more or less inspired, is simply to say that nobody is inspired, and that one book is no more authoritative than another.

Why do we have Christmas presents in Christian homes? Because the parents do not love their children at other times? No; but because the children's minds become sluggish in the presence of merely regular kindness, and special gifts wake them up to gratitude. Shall God alone be shut up to dull uniformity of action? Shall God alone be unable to make special communications of his love? Frances Power Cobbe says well: "It is a singular fact that, whenever we find out how a thing is done, our first conclusion seems to be that God did not do it." The more law the sinful soul sees, the less God it recognizes, and, therefore, God at times mercifully breaks through the chain of ordinary sequences, and shows that they do not exhaust his power. Miracle and inspiration prove that God is not entombed in nature, but that he is above nature, a transcendent as well as an immanent God.

DIVINE ACTIVITY VS. SIN.

This method of thought substitutes, for sin, a form of the divine activity. The tendency to identify all natural causes with God's working is also a tendency to identify the human will with God's working. To those who hold this view, there really is but one substance—man and nature alike are but modifications of the divine being. And, therefore, sin is the product of divine casuality, the strange creation of the all-working God. Such a conclusion is, of course, so plainly immoral, and so destructive of our fundamental conceptions of God, that it needs to be spoken with bated breath and to be veiled in ambiguous phrase. Sin is called a metaphysical necessity, a mere negation, a dark background without which good could not appear in its true brightness.

But all this is the direct contradiction to conscience and to Scripture. These testify that sin is the abominable thing that God hates, that it is the product of the human will, not of the divine activity. Man is himself a creative first cause, and he has used his creative activity in the production of moral evil. Here we have the proof that monism is false. God and man are not of the same substance, else moral evil had been impossible. Every monistic system breaks in pieces when it attempts to deal with the fact of sin. The accusations of conscience and the threatenings of God are swift witnesses to disprove any exercise-theory or negation-theory which would transfer the blame of sin from man to his Maker, and those who make the human soul the mere manifestation of an *anima mundi*, or world-soul, need well to ponder God's words: "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness!"

HUMANITY VS. DEITY IN CHRIST.

This method of thought substitutes for deity in Jesus Christ, a mere humanity after the model of our own. The old way of denying Christ's deity was by making him to be only man. The new way of denial is much more subtle and ingenious; it simply says that we are all God. "Jesus Christ is the only God," said William Blake to Crabb Robinson, "and so am I, and so are you." Because God is in all men, all men are therefore God; and Jesus Christ is a being not different in kind from ourselves. So we find Hegel writing: "I can say with Christ, not only that I teach the truth, but that I am the truth." And in the *Paradise Lost*, John Milton represents even the prince of fallen angels as saying:

> "the son of God I am, or was;
> And if I was, I am; relation holds;
> All men are sons of God."

Yet these utterances are only logical consequences of this exaggeration of the divine immanence of which I have been speaking. When the only God that exists is the God in us and in the universe, then the transition is easy to self-deification and the deification of nature.

But, as if in preparation for this modern doctrine that all men are sons of God in the same sense that Jesus is, the Scripture speaks of "the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father," and of "the glory which he had with the Father before the world was." Christ is Son in a sense not predicable of the most exalted creature. He is Son by being of the same essence or substance with the Father, uncreated and eternal. The essence or substance of man's being is of a different sort—it once was not, and it now is only by the creative act of God. Christ saves us from idolatry of the creature by presenting in himself the true image of the Godhead, by showing us that there are heights of divine purity and power which our human nature cannot reach. Without belief in this transcendent God who manifests himself in Christ, the arch of Christian faith loses its keystone and falls. As the apostle John declares: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world."

SUBJECTIVE VS. OBJECTIVE ATONEMENT.

This method of thought substitutes, for an objective atonement to God for human sin, the mere subjective moral influence of Jesus' life and example. Everything on this theory is internal. Our thoughts are turned within. We hear of salvation by character. The trouble is that we have no character that we can be saved by. Our character is a bad character. We need to hear, not of salvation *by* character, but of salvation *from* character. And over against the bad character of which conscience accuses us, and corresponding to the sense of ill-desert within, is the objective holiness of God which condemns us.

How be rid of guilt for ill-doing and ill-being? This theory can consistently answer only by denying the fact of guilt, and identifying it with subjective impurity. How be free from fear of God's judgment? This theory can consistently answer only by denying that justice in God is anything more than love. The necessity of atonement is removed by annihilating the fundamental attribute of God. Man does not need forgiveness, but only reformation. I do not see how this doctrine of a merely immanent God, working in man's heart, can ever satisfy the clamors of the remorseful conscience, or give peace to the sinner. Nothing but the atonement made to God in our behalf by a crucified Saviour can do that. When we come to the question of salvation, we must remember that it is a transcendent God with whom we have to deal. It is an objective guilt that needs to be removed, a God above us who needs to be reconciled. We want one who has gone into the heavens, and has presented there, as our priest, the blood of Calvary. When we see Christ as our atoning Saviour, then, and not till then, can we sing:

> "A guilty, weak and helpless worm
> On thy kind arms I fall:
> Be thou my strength and righteousness,
> My Saviour and my all!"

[By inadvertence, the whole of Dr. Strong's first article was not printed last week. The concluding paragraphs of it are given here, and should be read in connection with the discussion of the Divine Immanence, immediately preceding the article of this week on the Divine Transcendence.]

NATURAL CONSEQUENCES VS. PENALTY.

This method of thought substitutes, for penalty, the mere natural consequences of transgression. Punishment is regarded as only the reaction of natural law, the impotence of the broken limb, the pain which disease brings in its train. The only results of sin are subjective results. We are told that the present generation has not so great an appetite for retribution as our grandfathers had. It is thought unscientific to insist that there is a soul to be punished—psychology without a soul answers all our needs. And, with belief in a soul, belief also in a God who can destroy both soul and body in hell is relegated to the realm of exploded superstitions.

Now we grant that natural consequences are a part of the penalty of sin, but we deny that they exhaust it. In all penalty there is a personal element—the personal wrath of the Lawgiver—which natural consequences only partially express. The boy's disobedience may have cost him the tearing of his clothes and the bruising of his body, but it is not that which makes him afraid. What he fears is the sight of his father's face, and the infliction of the threatened punishment. So, over and above nature and nature's laws, is the living God, into whose hands it is a fearful thing to fall. Men fear death, because they fear to meet God. Natural law works *before* death—but *after* death comes judgment. When we so exaggerate the doctrine of God's immanence as to deny that there is any difference between this world of probation and the other world of retribution, when we hold out hopes of grace and mercy in the next world to those who die impenitent in this, we are not only going beyond all warrant of Scripture, but we are imperilling men's souls. I know nothing about the terms of salvation but what the Bible tells me, and that speaks of a great gulf fixed, and of a time when change of state is impossible. God is transcendent as well as immanent; before him we are to give account; there is to be a revelation of his righteous judgment different from anything which natural law discloses; "to fall into the hands of the living God" is to fall into the hands, not simply of the law, but also of the Lawgiver.

It costs us too much then to accept the doctrine of the divine immanence as an exclusive statement of the truth. With the loss of the divine transcendence, we lose the personal and living God, identify him with nature, and endanger the most important articles of the Christian faith. We can intelligently hold to Creation, Providence, Miracles, Inspiration, Sin, the Deity and Atonement of Christ, and Future Retribution, only so long as we maintain with the apostle that God is "above all," as well as "through all" and "in you all." In the course of what has been said, many reasons for belief in God's transcendence have been suggested. But there are certain facts of our mental and moral nature which even more conclusively refute the prevalent exaggeration of God's immanence. These facts I shall hope to set forth in the article which is to follow.

II.

The Transcendence of God: its Philosophical and Religious Necessity.

In a former article I mentioned certain modern exaggerations of the doctrine of God's immanence. I wish now to present the claims of a great complementary truth—the truth of God's transcendence. Let us look at it from the points of view, first, of philosophy, and secondly, of religion.

FREE-WILL PROVES TRANSCENDENCE.

There is no fact of our moral nature more important or significant than that of free-will. Free-will is proof that we are not simply *in* nature, but that we are *above* nature. The brute is not so—he is a purely natural being; he acts only as he is acted upon; to use the apt simile of Dr. Samuel Harris, he is like a balloon driven hither and thither unresistingly by the currents that set around him. But man is distinguished from the beast by the fact that in him is a supernatural element; he has a power of initiative and self-movement; he acts, at least sometimes, from within; he is like a ship, which, though subject to influences of wind and tide, can yet set its sails and determine its course at pleasure.

There is, of course, an automatic element in man; heredity and environment and character, to a large extent, bind him; most of his acts are, probably, determined by what he is and by the influences that work upon him. But this is not the whole of him; at times he shows a power to work against his surroundings and his past character, and to strike out a new course; he can act upon nature, and accomplish what nature, left to herself, never could. I show my *freedom* when I decide, after long debate, that I will walk to the centre of the town instead of remaining at my house; I show the *automatic* exercise of will when I put one foot before another, and almost unconsciously take the multitude of successive steps which are necessary to the carrying out of my purpose.

DETERMINISM ONLY A HALF-TRUTH.

Determinism, or the theory that I am merely the creature of my surroundings, takes account of my automatic or executive action, but ignores the higher function of my will—that free choice between alternatives. Consciousness testifies that we are not shut up to one course alone. And when the determinist insists that the freedom of the will is freedom to act only in one way, we reply that such freedom is no freedom at all. "Johnny," says the mother, "did you give your little sister the choice between those two apples this morning?" "Yes, mother," says Johnny, "I told her she could have the little one or none, and she chose the little one." Evidently there was not much freedom there.

Let us deny and denounce the doctrine that the human will can run only in a groove, that it is incapable of unique decisions, that it is a part of nature. But, if *man* be above nature and greater than nature, shall not *God* be so also? And shall we not also deny and denounce the doctrine that *God's* will can run only in a groove, that *it* is incapable of unique decisions, that *it* is a part of nature? So the consciousness of a transcendent element in us gives the assurance of a transcendent element in God. Knowing free-will in ourselves, seeing that God has disjoined from himself a certain portion of force and has constituted it into independent wills, we find no difficulty in believing that God has also in nature disjoined from himself certain portions of force, and has made them second causes.

God is not the only agent in the universe. The world is not a ghostly procession of divine ideas. Divine *will* has gone to the making of it. In *nature* we have a realm of necessitated agencies, yet with powers of their own; in *humanity* we have a realm of free beings, not parts and particles of God, but relatively independent of him and capable of subduing nature to their control; in *God* we have the primary Cause of all, free from all limitations except those which he has himself chosen, the Maker of the world and the Lord of it, not buried and hidden within its sequences, not shut up to uniform and automatic action, but able to do unique things, things never done before and never to be done again, like the creation of the world and the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. Wisdom does not mean monotony with God, any more than it does with us. Single acts with him, as with us, mark crises in the development of his plans and the revelation of his character. The laws of nature are the habits of God, but through the laws of nature break now and then flashes of his almightiness that prove him to be not simply an immanent but also a transcendent God.

CONSCIENCE PROVES TRANSCENDENCE.

There is another fact of human nature which throws light upon our subject, and that is the fact of conscience. Conscience witnesses to the existence of an authority above us and above the world. As Diman has said: "Conscience does not lay down a law; it warns us of the existence of a law; and not only of a law, but of a purpose—not our own, but the purpose of another, which it is our mission to realize." In the words of Murphy: "Conscience proves personality in the Lawgiver, because its utterances are not abstract, like those of reason, but are in the nature of command; they are not in the indicative, but in the imperative mood; it says: 'thou shalt' and 'thou shalt not.' This argues Will."

"The atheist," says Tulloch, "regards conscience, not as a skylight, opened to let in upon human nature an infinite dawn from above, but as a polished arch or dome, completing and reflecting the whole edifice beneath." But conscience cannot be the reflection and expression of nature, for it represses and condemns nature. "Like the magnetic needle, it indicates the existence of a mighty power which from afar controls its vibrations, and at whose presence it trembles." The moral law to which it witnesses is not self-imposed, and the threats of judgment which it utters are not self-executing. Conscience is not itself God's voice—it is, rather, the echo of God's voice; it is not God, but a part of self. And yet it tells of something above self and above the world—of God, not as immanent but as transcendent.

CONSCIENCE REFLECTS GOD'S HOLINESS.

This testimony of conscience is the most sublime fact of human nature; and, if we interpret it rightly, it will, more than any other fact of our nature, disclose to us the nature of God. "The relationship between the terms consciousness and conscience, which are in fact but forms of the same word, testifies to the fact that it is in the action of conscience that man's consciousness of himself is chiefly experienced." "As perception gives us Will in the shape of Causality over against us, so Conscience gives us Will in the shape of Authority over against us." It is a perpetual monument and memento of the Holiness of God, in whose image we are made. We learn that, as Conscience is supreme in the moral constitution of man, and before it every other impulse and affection has to bow, so Holiness is supreme in God and conditions the exercise of every other attribute of his nature.

God's holiness is symbolized and reflected in our moral constitution, but it is not exhaustively exhibited there. That holiness is not only outside of our conscience, but it is greater than our conscience. "If our own heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart and knoweth all things." So, in our ethical nature as well as in our voluntary nature, we have the evidence that God not only is "through all" and "in you all," but is also "above all"—in other words, our own being gives us proof that God is transcendent as well as immanent.

EXCLUSIVE IMMANENCE DESTROYS THEISM.

If we give up this transcendence, and believe in nothing but the immanent God to whom so many modern teachers would confine us, we might as well give up our Theism as well as our Christianity. For a God who is simply conterminous with the universe, and necessarily bound up with it, is neither almighty nor sovereign nor blessed nor free. Nothing is left us but a God who is only the obverse side or secondary aspect of the universe itself, a God who is in constant process of growth and evolution, and so is neither infinite nor perfect, neither personal, nor living, nor holy. Since there is no God outside the process of existing things, God exhausts himself in his present work; everything, good or bad, is the best that now can be; even God himself could not better my lot, for he has no strength beyond what he now exerts; there is no eye to pity and no arm to save. This is only the God of pantheism—a blind, dumb idol, substituted for the living God.

But does this exaggeration of the divine immanence cost us the loss of God only? Ah no! we lose man also. For with the freedom and holiness of God, we lose man's freedom and responsibility also. A *God* who is only another name for natural law must have for his complement a *man* who is but another name for natural law also. Man is but the creature of circumstance; his high ideals are dreams, impossible of fulfilment; there is no God, outside of and above the stream of things, to utter to him words of love or to satisfy his infinite desires; his very being is a mere part of nature, and, like nature itself, transitory and vanishing; "his self consciousness is a spark struck in the dark, to die away in the darkness whence it has arisen." With what poetic justice is the truth avenged! Man, in his sins, cannot bear the august picture of the God who is above all, and so makes for himself the image of a God confined to nature; but, worshipping this, he finds himself divested of his higher powers of will and conscience, and comes to picture himself also as confined to nature. In attacking God, we ruin ourselves. We tear the crown from our own brows when, in our blasphemy and folly, we "limit the holy One of Israel."

RELIGIOUS VALUE OF TRANSCENDENCE.

But, on the other hand, how great is the advantage to Christian faith and to Christian life of a strong hold upon the truth of God's transcendence! Only as we believe in it, do we apprehend the real greatness of God. The universe is finite, and a God confined to the universe is limited in wisdom and in power. Therefore, the Scripture sets God above, puts his dwelling-place in heaven, represents him as coming down to behold what is going on upon the earth. This, of course, is one side only of the truth, but it is, after all, the most important side. Immanence would be of little value, but for this background of transcendence. But, when we are told that the nations are before him but as grasshoppers, the small dust of the balance of which the tradesman makes no account in weighing, the drop of the bucket that trickles and falls into the well unnoticed, then we begin to appreciate how great a God he is with whom we have to do.

God is not in the universe, so much as the universe is in him. The universe is but the breath of his mouth—the drop of dew upon the fringe of his garment. God has never yet expended the tithe of his resources. Nature only partially reveals him. The eye of imagination can sweep over the whole vast collection of things which he has made, and yet say with Job: "Lo, these are but the outskirts of his ways, and how small a whisper do we hear of him; but the thunder of his power who can understand?" In God are yet unopened treasures, an inexhaustible fountain of new beginnings, new creations, new revelations. "Mercy shall be built up forever," says the Psalmist—the revelation of God's mercy is an edifice that is ever building, never built; stone shall be added to stone forever. Never throughout the endless future, as Christ leads forward his sacramental host to ever larger knowledge and joy, will there come a time when he cannot turn and say to them: "Greater things than these shall ye see!"

It is a wonderful thing that the humblest believer can call this transcendent God his friend. That an infinite Being should think of me, love me, save me from myself, make me his son and heir, this is something beyond the power of mere human reason to discover or to grasp. But it was precisely to remove my doubts, and to convince me of this, that the transcendent God came out of the light which no man hath seen or can see, and entered into the darkness of this world. A supernatural and miraculous Saviour, God manifested in human flesh, crucified and buried, but the third day risen from the dead—these simple and attested historical facts are my guarantee, as against all speculative difficulties and unbelieving fears, that he is not dead, or shut up in nature, or reduced to mere uniformities of action. In the cross of Christ eighteen hundred years ago, and in the work of the regenerating Spirit to-day, I find the proof and assurance I so sorely need, that there is "One God and Father of all who is above all," as well as "through all, and in you all."

TRANSCENDENCE IN ART.

In many of our cities the "Angelus" of Millet has recently been exhibited. It represents two toil-worn peasants at sunset, ceasing from their work, at the sound of the distant church-bell, to lift up hearts of gratitude and worship to the God above. As the two sombre figures with bowed heads stand there against the evening sky, the whole heaven is luminous and the very silence seems to speak. The picture has been criticised because the landscape is not minutely painted, and the gradation of aerial effects is not technically correct. But the obvious reply is that Millet has aimed to paint, not *air*, but *prayer*. The artist is more than an artist, more than a mere imitator of nature; he sets before us the ideal truth of which nature is the symbol; we see the dignity of humble labor, the dependence of man upon a higher Power, the glory of communion with the infinite and invisible One.

Millet's "Angelus" was born of Bible-reading and religious reverence; it expresses the deep sense of God's transcendence; and this, even more than its artistic quality, makes the picture great. The highest art is the handmaid of religion—that only is the highest art which leads us from nature up to nature's God. It is not the God who is interfused through all things that is the subject and inspiration of the "Angelus."

The soul, oppressed and benumbed by the unvarying round of nature, seeks outlet and relief; and, if there be no transcendent God, the deepest want of our being is forever unsatisfied. At times we feel that we cannot longer live unless God reveal himself to us. We cry like David: "O Lord, my Rock, be not silent to me; lest, if thou be silent to me, I become like them that go down into the pit." Amid our heavy burdens we pray, as Moses prayed: "I beseech thee, show me thy glory!" And then, while we are hidden from the world as in a cleft of the rock, God makes his glory to pass before us, and proclaims to us his ineffable name, and in the strength of that meat we go many days.

THE BEST PROOF OF TRANSCENDENCE.

So we have proofs of the supernatural, better than any picture can give—namely, the personal dealings of God with our souls. To many and many a Christian the beginning of the Christian life was marked by such a revelation to him of the living God. He has, moreover, the promise of yet other revelations along the Christian way—Christ has given definite assurance that he will manifest himself to his followers as he does not to the world.

It is the business of the believer to seek the fulfilment of this promise—to pray for special communications of this grace and love. But not for his own sake only—for the sake of others also. God certifies himself to the Christian, that the Christian may certify him to the world. So the Psalmist prayed: "O God, forsake me not, until I have showed thy strength to this generation, and thy power to every one that is to come!" In the design of God each individual joined to Christ is to be, in the answers to prayer which he receives, in the pure and spiritual life which he leads, in the benignant and quickening influence which he exerts, a living demonstration of the supernatural, a proof stronger than any syllogism can afford that God has come down out of the heights of his glory to redeem and save. May we not hope that, in spite of the mighty drift of our time toward a denial of God's power and divinity, a multitude of his saints will still have in themselves, and will still give to others, this mightier and more convincing witness to the transcendence of God?

OBER-AMMERGAU AFTER THE "PASSIONS SPIEL."

From *The Church Times* (London,) November 14, 1890.

OBER-AMMERGAU, Oct. 31.

A FEW notes from Ober-Ammergau will be of interest to many. Those who stayed on, after the representations, into the quiet of the week between the Sundays of the season of the Passions Spiel will remember the charms of the village. How much more delightful, then, it is, now that the good people have settled down to their various occupations, may be easily imagined. I would like to mention something which occurred toward the end of the season.

Thursday, September 25th, was the day set apart in this parish for the perpetual adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. This is taken in turn by all the churches in the diocese of Munich and Friesing, the religious houses taking the nights and the ordinary churches the days, during which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, with a great number of lighted candles. The event which occurred on this Thursday was a Protestant funeral; the first, I believe, since 1860, when the good pastor Daisenberger incurred ecclesiastical censure for himself by according full rites to a Protestant.

On Sunday, September 21st, a young Protestant student from Bonn University was present at the representation. On the Monday he walked to the Crucifixion group, given by the late King Ludwig II., and on his way back he fell down in a fit: he was carried to the hospital and died there. A Protestant military chaplain from Weilheim was telegraphed for, and he conducted the service on the Thursday. The village band, accompanied by the school children and the "Lieder Kranz," together with the priest, Burgomeister, Josef Mayer, and many others, went to the hospital, and from there walked in procession, the band playing solemnly all the way. First came a white cross wreathed, carried by a child; then came the school children; afterward the parochial funeral, processional crucifix, and so on. At the grave side the Protestant pastor, attired in black, with white bands and the peculiar round cap (something like an ordinary German infantry cap enlarged) conducted the service, frequently using the sign of the cross, and delivering a touching address. At the close the "Lieder Kranz" sang a very beautiful hymn unaccompanied. Those attending the funeral held lighted candles.

All this in a thoroughly Roman Catholic part of the world was something not soon to be forgotten. On the Tuesday after the last representation—*i.e.*, September 30th, the whole of the villagers pilgrimaged to Ettal. This they do in the spring and again in the autumn. One noted a fresh idea for English village school processions. All walk on each side of the road; banners or occasional groupings in the middle at intervals, much more dignified in general effect than the usual two and two in the middle of the road, much more convenient also for vehicular traffic. Country parsons should note this for their next school outdoor procession. Another ecclesiastical event was the Festival of the Rosen Kranz (Rosary), October 5th, when the whole parish made a procession of the Blessed Sacrament through the fields, and back to the church. Considering the thorough manner in which the Ober-Ammergauers carry out everything they take in hand, the general effect of this may be easily imagined by those to whom the sight of a foreign procession is familiar, and who remember those large banners on the tall poles in Ober-Ammergau parish church, all of which figured in the procession. Some cows which were quietly grazing, attracted by the children repeating their "Aves" and "Paters," seemed to think it was milking time, and setting off, joined the procession, thereby causing a somewhat unanticipated and grotesque situation.

Sunday, October 12th, was observed as the annual Harvest Thanksgiving in the church. There were no decorations; just a *Missa Cantata* and *Te Deum*. On October 19th came the "Kirche Weih" (Church Dedication Festival), quite a parochial carnival —flag on church tower, etc. This is kept by all the neighboring parishes on the same date, because in years past it made such an upset; one set of villagers visiting another on the festivals to such an extent that it interrupted work, and led to too much pleasure making. Every one goes in for new clothes, as at Easter or Whitsuntide with us.

The usual Church services, of course, *Missa Cantata* 8 A.M., with sermons by the Pfarrer (parish priest). At 5 P.M. an octette played at the "Gasthaus zur Rose," and in the evening there was a good dance—and why not? On the Monday and Tuesday the dancing was kept up again till well in the small hours. On the Monday of the "Kirche Weih" there was a commemorative service of Ober-Ammergauers who have at any time perished in war. All those who have served in the army mustered at the

Burgomeister's house at 9 A.M., and, headed by the band playing the same two marches, which every one will remember on the Saturday evenings during the Passions Spiel season, they marched to the church, the standard-bearer, with the Burgomeister on his right, and Josef Mayer on his left, following immediately after the band. In the church, where the catafalque for *Requiems* is always placed, was a military trophy in addition to the ordinary catafalque with lighted candles, two flags, drums, guns, swords, etc.

After "Kirche Weih" came Sunday, October 26th, the thanksgiving after the "Passions Spiel," with a sermon by the Benefiziat Carl von Brentano, or the Professor, as every one seems to call him, and who I often think bears a slight resemblance in the distance to the late Cardinal Newman. They sing a German *Te Deum* here to a tune similar to "Sun of my Soul" (Hursley), A. and M., with a repeat in it.

I have been present at many funerals and *Requiems* here, all of which have been very striking; but last Monday, October 27th, I came in for a change in the form of a double wedding of a brother and sister from the same house, that of Sebastian Lang "Bildhauer," the bandmaster, who lives in a blue-coloured house near the theatre. First of all came the civil part of the ceremony at the Rath Haus, which took up some time. The M. C. at all weddings is Thomas Rendl (the "Pilatus"). Rosemary seems to be the proper thing to wear at weddings, a good sprig forming a true, old-fashioned buttonhole. The band conducted the wedding party to church, the bridegrooms and their men walking first, and then the brides with two bridesmaids on each side of them. All wore thin shoes and dresses, though there was plenty of snow on the ground. The brides wore black silk dresses with white veils and imitation orange blossom. The ring part of the ceremony in church seemed similar to our own, and the wrapping of the stole round the hands formed an impressive addition. During the *Missa Cantata,* which was well sung (especially an unaccompanied hymn, which was very lovely), the four knelt at a fald-stool in front of the altar.

At the conclusion of the service, all the immediate wedding party, with the brides, their husbands, and the other guests, went to the right side of the altar to drink the blessed wine. It is usual also for all the people to go up to the right of the altar to drink the blessed wine (the love of St. John) on St. John's Day, December 27th. I am not sure, but I believe this is a local custom. The band escorted the wedding party all the way to the house right at the far end of the village. The husbands and men going first as before, and the brides and their attendants following—picking their way through the snow. On the way, about five young men, running to meet the brides, barred their progress, and they had to pay toll in hard cash. In the house feasting and dancing were kept up till 3 A.M. I should add that the "Pilatus" saw them safely through, both in church and afterward, to the end of the evening.

The next day another wedding of much interest came off, one Josef Albrecht, a promising student at the carving school. The service in church was much the same as on the Monday. In the evening the festivities were held at the "Alten Post Gasthaus," and as "Pilatus" kindly came with a special invitation, I had the privilege of being present at what I would not have missed on any account. After the feast came some dancing to the music of a "sextette;" how gracefully they dance, too! Whatever they are about there is a sort of refinement of manner which one would look for in vain in an English country village. Later on "Pilatus," with a lighted candle in front of him—all being in order—proceeded to toast the bride and bridegroom, and the whole wedding party. He first of all delivered a long and very beautiful speech, written originally for him by Pastor Daisenberger. Those who heard his diction in the Passions Spiel, can well imagine Thomas Rendl standing up in this crowded room in a "public-house" in the midst of the wedding party and many others who were assembled there, and eloquently, with dignified gesture, delivering this oration, which touched upon the Marriage of Cana in Galilee, and how the Father is always at one with His children in their joys as well as their sorrows. He concluded by reciting in German the *Pater Noster* and *Ave Maria.* Fancy such a speech in an English "public-house" at a wedding feast—but why not?

The speech being concluded he proceeded to "toast," giving first the name in full of each person, and a full description as to relationships, etc., concluding with "*er*—(or '*sie*')—*soll leben! Hoch!* and a flourish—very much a flourish—by the sextette. This, in the case of each person, took some time. Then came more dancing, the bride leading off with a relation of the bridegroom, and *vice versâ.* After this the presentations—a bottle of wine and a glass, and a large bowl of small cakes in front of the married pair. The master of the ceremonies, sitting to the left of the bridegroom, had a large tureen with a plate on the top, and a book with all the names of the guests. A woman friend of the bride sat to her right, with a napkin having one corner turned over. In addition to the presents usually given, it is the custom for each guest whose name is called out to come up and put money (six or eight marks perhaps) on the plate over the tureen, which is immediately turned into that receptacle; also to give something to the woman friend, who conceals the amount in the napkin. A further present may or may not be given. Each guest shakes hands with the bride and bridegroom, and, after drinking some wine and taking some cake, retires. The amount in the tureen helps to pay the expenses of the wedding and the after festivities, but the husband is supposed to know nothing of the contents of the napkin, which serves as pin money for the bride. The presents were numerous, and of all kinds; rolls of wax taper (used in church at *Requiems*), coffee-pots and coffee-cups, liqueur sets, beer mugs, vases, and all manner of household implements, down to a feeding-bottle and a small pan they use here for heating infants' food; this was filled with small dolls dressed as babies, and caused much amusement. More dancing followed till 3 A.M.

Another idea for school tea-parties in the country: as to payment of the musicians. Part of the room is reserved for the dancers. At the commencement of each dance each man pays 20 pfennigen (a penny each). The people here are by no means well off, yet they manage to pay. Such a plan would simplify matters and equalize things in charging for a tea-party entrance, and letting the dancers pay extra afterward on the system I have mentioned.

The wedding party met again the next day at the "Lamm Gasthaus" from 4 to 8 P.M. Look at this part of the world. They have "public-houses" proper, and the "public" utilize them. If one could find, or rather if it could only be the proper thing to find the parish priest, the schoolmasters, the village doctor, and the various local luminaries (or those who consider them so), all able to meet on friendly terms for a short convivial time in a "public-house" in England, without coming across any swearing or drunkenness, things would be very different, and a healthier tone would be prevalent. Here, even in the after "Passion" season, there are nine public-houses for the 1300 inhabitants; there is plenty of room for the people to sit down and talk quietly, or play a harmless game of cards. No swearing, no drunkenness—but that comes of having decent beer. As Archdeacon Farrar says of a crowd, "Here and everywhere it was impossible for an Englishman not to deplore the contrast presented by this crowd and the crowds which assemble at places of amusements on our Bank Holidays. The youths, most of whom had fine, open, honest faces, and wore flowers in their hats or at their button-holes, were all polite and well behaved. Many of them were drinking beer with their lunch, but the beer was thin, wholesome, and perfectly harmless lager beer, on which no one could easily get intoxicated. There was no noise, no rowdyism, no drunkenness, no coarse language, no bad behaviour, but much quiet and courteous happiness. To charge it as a crime against the people of Ober Ammergau that they drink beer is absurd. If no more intoxicating drink than this lager beer were drunk in England, instead of the heady, stupefying, adulterated poison consumed by our own peasantry, it would be well for us. It is a singular incidental sign of the religious spirit of the people that over the brewery which has occupied the Monastery of Ettal since its secularization in 1803 still runs the ancient pious chronogram, 'May God bless the beer of Ettal.'" Such are the "gasthauses," not mere beer-houses or gin palaces, sinks of iniquity (which, by the way, "coffee palaces" are equally capable of becoming). One more thing one sees frequently here in the public-houses. Every one may be talking, and suddenly the church bell is heard ringing the *Angelus*. At once every hat is removed, and instead of the ostentatious crossing and gabbling one may have observed elsewhere, all seem quietly intent and self-collected, saying to themselves their "Our Father" and the commemoration of the Incarnation. If people in England could thus pull themselves together, as a mark of respect for the things not of this world in the midst of this "hurrying life," perhaps there would be less drunkenness and gambling, less evil speaking, lying, and slandering, less coveting and obtaining, by one way or another, other men's goods, which is one way of doing "good business." "But, tush! I am puling," as the vicar in the *Sorcerer* observed.

The covered part of the auditorium at the theatre now contains all the rows of seats piled up, also the houses of Annas and Pilate, and the streets of Jerusalem, the front being all boarded up. The stage itself likewise is boarded up, the middle part, where the audience sat in the open air, being all levelled and tidied up till 1900. I do not know whether many know of the "Kreuz Schule," a play given in 1875, after the erection of the "Calvary" given by the late King Ludwig II. I believe it had then not been represented since 1833. The action consists of Old Testament scenes, the tableaux being from the New ; there is also music. I ventured, rightly or wrongly, to suggest what a boon it would be to many if an opportunity could be given next year of witnessing this play. The answer was that it would be ruination to the village to be upset again, that if the regular routine of the carving industry suffered from so marked an interruption, all that goes to make Ober-Ammergau what it is would be at an end, and there would certainly be no Passions Spiel in 1900.

A word as to some erroneous impressions, which, I believe, are current. 1. The literal translation of the word "Herrgottschnitzer" is somewhat misleading ; the word simply means carver of the Christus figures for crucifixes. Josef Mayer has, I believe, never carved figures, but he has engraved crosses such as one sees them doing now in the Schnitz Schule. 2. The Kofel cross falling is no such catastrophe as some have made out, indicating the will of Providence that the Passions Spiel shall be discontinued. The cross is frequently blown down and set up again. 3. "The Ober-Ammergauers have been well paid for all the hospitality they have shown," say some people. Have they ? I should just like people who say so to have seen all the taking down of beds on hire which had to be returned and paid for. Consider the cost of building the large houses necessitated by the advent of the visitors. Consider the cost of the food, which was much more expensive during the "Passion" season than at other times—so much so, in fact, that to barely cover the cost of their keep it became necessary to insist on visitors remaining two days.

Those who stayed on during the week-days will remember all the extensive washings and preparations for the incursion of the following Saturday. And now that all are steadily at work again, one can better understand what they must have lost by being compelled to abstain from their ordinary vocations while extending their hospitality to the visitors, who after all knew beforehand more or less what the cost would be. In this connection two "beauties"—a "he" and a "she"—who were staying in the house where I write, being dissatisfied with the homely but excellent table kept by our host, sallied forth in quest of gastronomic indulgence. They returned exulting in that they had made a capital dinner at the Herrgottschnitzer Café, having consumed soup, trout from the Amber, "Ober-Ammergau ducks" (they must have had canvas-back ducks in their minds' eye) and champagne !—a nice prelude to the object of their pilgrimage here. These identical ideals (English, I am sorry to say) happened to sit behind me at the theatre, and during the lovely plaintive music which followed the Crucifixion scene ("Liebe, Liebe") they were chattering away as hard as they could, discussing how the hanging on the cross was managed.

On another similar occasion, some one remarked to some talkative English, "I am afraid this music must interfere sadly with your conversation." Another interesting specimen. An American (*apropos* of the wood carving) "reckoned" it would be a good thing if some one would start a silk factory here, which he "guessed" would be a "darned site better" than all the "cussed" image-making. All these good souls would probably return with mixed impressions, one doubtless being that the Ober-Ammergauers were well paid.

It seems a graceless and disgraceful thing to visit the good people and partake of their hospitality and then to say "they were well paid." They were not well paid ; they have, it is true, covered the expenses at the theatre with the receipts for the tickets there, and there is a small surplus for the new hospital. The costumes for the actors were designed by Herr Ludwig Lang, the talented master of the Schnitz Schule here, and cut out by his sister, Fräulein Josefa Lang, who superintended the making of them by the young women of the village who assembled last winter at the Rath Haus for the purpose ; and yet I believe many think that these costumes came from the Opera Houses of Munich or Vienna.

Once in ten years is not a very great matter, if a good surplus of profit had remained. The whole ratable value of the community is less than £250 a year, out of which contributions have to go to the salaries of the parish priest, the Burgomeister and his secretary, the expenses of the schoolmasters, and the carving school, so that a little margin once in ten years can hardly be grudged those to whom all Europe is grateful, and glad enough to come for what can be obtained here—a retreat from the world. And now the village sleeps—so to put it—for ten years, till the beginning of the twentieth century.

Here is a translation of the notice which was posted up in the dressing rooms, and about the back of the stage, on the last Sunday :—"The Passion Play for this century draws to a close, and God's blessing has been visibly with us. Let us, therefore, offer to God our thanksgiving in this last Representation by striving to show forth with that earnestness and dignity of which the story is worthy, the sufferings and death of our Divine Lord and Saviour." They have done their work, and as with everything else, they have done it well. As I write, the village is, perhaps, more lovely than ever it was during the season. It is All Hallow E'en. The mountains and trees are covered with snow, the cross on the Kofel is gleaming in the sun. The good Ober-Ammergauers are straightening-up the churchyard, preparing their graves for "Alle Heiligen."

Many will be sorry to hear that the "Choragus," Jacob Rutz, has just lost a young son, who died suddenly on Wednesday night. He will be buried to-morrow. Would that we in England had more care for our dead and their resting-places!

Many lessons may, indeed, be learned here, and many, doubtless, have been. There is an inexpressible enchantment in this secluded valley, 2800 feet above the North Sea level, specially when the moon and brilliant stars are shining on a snow-clad landscape. A charm lingers about the hill-sides in the remembrance of what has been enacted here, recalling the sentiments which filled one's mind in the fields of Bethlehem, or on the hill-sides of the sea of Galilee. It would indeed be a disaster if too many strangers made this an ordinary resort, though undoubtedly many will come here again to visit the friends who treated them so well this year. It is much to be hoped that the English offering of a new organ for the church here will be largely and liberally supported. Few who came here returned without a warm place in their hearts for the place and people, and that warmth will kindle a desire to co-operate in the scheme for replacing the present broken-down instrument which has to do duty for the services in the church. Donations of any sums from 1*s*. upward may be sent to Sir Samuel Scott, Bart., & Co., Bankers, 1, Cavendish-Square, W., to order of Sir Samuel Scott, Bart., & Co.

INTERNATIONAL AND INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OF SUNDAY-SCHOOL LESSONS.*

BY PROFESSOR SYLVESTER BURNHAM, D.D.

From *The National Baptist*, Philadelphia, December 4, 1890.

THERE are two things I wish to say before reading the paper I have prepared. One is, that I should be most unwilling even to seem to be lacking in regard or respect for those both older and wiser than myself. If I seem, in this paper, to be thus lacking, it is simply because I remembered that the Secretary's bell would ring at the end of twenty-five minutes, and yet I wished to say clearly and plainly what I have to say. The other matter is, that I have not tried to prove all the statements contained in the paper. It was necessary to assume that some things were known to be true, in order to attempt to prove anything in the time allowed me.

The question before us, as I conceive it, is this :

Can the present system of the International Sunday-school Lessons be justly regarded as an ideal, or a final, method for the study of the Bible in the Sunday-school : or ought we to look for something better, which shall replace it? My own position on this question is, that the time has come to lay aside the method of the International Lessons, and to adopt for our Sunday schools a system of lessons more in harmony with the demands of true Bible study. In assuming this position, I do not mean to say that the system of the International Lessons has no merits ; still less to claim that it has not been of great service in its day. I would not like to say, moreover, that is not better than the system, or the no-system, of Sunday-school lessons that preceded it.

The Old Chemistry also was a useful science in its day ; but we study and teach the New Chemistry now, and do not mourn because the former things have passed away.

In like manner, it is possible that the good thing of yesterday in Bible study may become the hindrance of to-day. My objection to the International Lessons, as an ideal, or final, method of Bible study arises, first, from what I find this system is ; and secondly, from what it is not.

First, therefore, the International System of Lessons ought to be replaced by some other method of Bible study, because of what this system is. For the system, in some of its characteristic features, is centrally and essentially opposed to modern ideas of true educational methods.

---

* Read at the Baptist Congress, New Haven, Conn., Nov. 12, 1890.

Under this head, we notice, first, that the International System proceeds, from year to year, without unity of subject. It aims neither at teaching the whole Bible as a unit of study, nor any one of the elements which make it up, such as history, poetry, law, or prophecy, as a subject by itself. According to its method, one only knows that he is studying some passages, or, at the most, some book to be found in the Scriptures. Even if we have the life of Christ this year, and the reign of the Kings of Judah the next year, and fragments from the epistle to the Romans in the third, still there cannot be said to be any real unity of subject in such a study of the Bible. Such a study has, indeed, its value. It is far better than no study ; but it cannot be regarded, with any justness, as ideal or final. What would be thought of a course of study in any school that prescribed history for one term, poetry for the next, logic for a third, and philosophy for a fourth, and then arranged these same subjects in another and another order in successive years, the order depending largely upon fancy, and the particular topic in each subject depending, apparently, upon nothing? Yet, from an educational point of view, this is precisely the method of the International Lessons. How, then, can this system have any just claim to endure for a long time to come, if only the fittest ought to survive?

But, secondly, the International Lessons proceed without definiteness of purpose. Every well-regulated school, and every good course of study, have some definite aim to secure, or else it is condemned by modern educational ideas. It may be sought either to give a definite amount and kind of mental training, or to impart thorough and systematic knowledge on a definite number of subjects ; or both these ends may be aimed at. But, so far as appears after quite a number of years, the International Lessons cannot be said to seek, in any real way, either of these objects. Its total result, thus far, seems to be some scrappy information about special portions, larger or smaller, of the Bible, with no very definite indication of any use to which this information could be put. It is not easy to see how the system could have held its ground so long as it has, if all this time there had not been in the church a large amount of ignorances, not only in regard to what the Bible really is, but also as to how and for what it ought to be studied. But a system that holds its ground by the ignorance of its students, or even the lack of competent teachers, has in itself the reason and the prophecy of its abolishment.

In the third place, the International System is completely ungraded in its material. In this respect, it is utterly opposed to modern educational ideas. One of the points of which its advocates make much is that, by its method, all the Sunday-schools of the world are studying the same lesson in all their classes at the same time. This is exactly what they ought not to be doing. In this matter it is one of the greatest defects of the system. What should we have to say of an educational system, whose boast was that all the schools of the United States, Primary Schools, High Schools, Colleges and Professional Schools, were all engaged at the same hour in the study of the same epoch in history, the same passage in literature, the same problem in mathematics, the same question in philosophy, or the same doctrine in theology? The preposterousness of such a system is clear from the mere statement of the case. The sentimental and empty boast would not keep the system in being a single hour. Can we be justified, then, in adopting for our study of the Bible a method which we would not tolerate for the study of arithmetic and geography? It is absurd to think of teaching Isaiah and Romans, Ezekiel and Colossians, Daniel and Revelation, to the younger classes in our Sunday-schools. We might as well introduce the study of conic sections and metaphysics into our primary schools. If we attempt to teach them to the younger scholars, we shall either fail to teach them anything at all, or only succeed in teaching what is not so. But a system of lessons, which proposes to omit entirely these portions of the Bible from the study of the Sunday-school, surely cannot be called an ideal or a final system of Bible study. Besides, it would practically declare to be true the dangerous heresy that the Bible *is* not the Word of God, but only *contains* the Word of God. So that, with these parts of the Bible excluded, or included, the International System stands condemned for what it is.

Let us now see, on the other hand, why this system cannot justly claim to be the true system for Sunday-school work because of what it is *not*.

In general, it may be said that the International Lessons lack largely, or entirely, the essential characteristics which, according to modern exegetical science, belong to true Bible study. But true Bible study must meet the demands of exegetical science, because Bible study is essentially interpretation, and interpretation is a scientific process. It remains, therefore, to point out the essential characteristics which must belong to scientific Bible study, and which the International Lessons do not possess.

In regard to this matter it is to be said, first, true Bible study will be Chronological. By this is meant that each book must be studied as the product of its own particular age; and all the books must be considered in their chronological relations to one another. For the science of interpretation shows us that every book is born out of its own age, and has its birth marks in it. Thus it comes to pass that the same words and the same forms of expression do not, in every age, or in the mouth of every man in the same age, have always the same meaning. If, therefore, we do not know the age of the book we study, and the kind of the book we study, and the kind of thinking and life that characterized the age, we may miss much of the true meaning of the book. Much of our Bible study at the present time, and much of the so highly praised "Bible Readings," err not a little in neglecting this important factor in true Bible study. The work proceeds by words or phrases, and not by attention to dates and ages. Key-words, such as faith, righteousness, Day of the Lord, hell or others of this sort are selected, and passages are made to harmonize in a melody upon this key with little regard to the strain in which they were written at first. But this way of doing is contrary to common sense, and, therefore, contrary to the scientific method. For science, after all, is only systematized common sense. We do not use other literature in this fashion. No one thinks of seeing in the term chemistry in books of a hundred years ago, the meaning which this term now has. No one supposes that the writer of fifty years ago, in speaking of public conveyances, means limited vestibule railway trains. Why should it any more be taken for granted that the faith of Abraham was in all respects like the faith of Paul; or that the hell of a psalm writer was the same as that which Jesus spoke of in awful terms of anxious love and fear? The Bible books were not less inspired because they were born of the age in which they appeared, even as Christ was not less divine because he was human. He was the Son of God, because he was also the Son of man. The Bible is, in the same way, divine, because it is human. Not to study it, therefore, as other books are studied, in its relations to the times that produced it, is to study it falsely. But this chronological element is left out of the sight almost altogether in the International Lessons.

Secondly, true Bible study will be literary. By this is meant that the Bible must be studied not so much as a book, but rather as books. In such a study, each book must be taken as a literary whole, in which every part has its meaning in consequence of its relations to this whole. All the parts, moreover, are to be given their meaning in view of the occasion that produced the book and the purpose for which it was written. Nothing can be more absurd than the far too common practice of selecting for study or for a text a few words of the Bible, without any reference to the relation of these words to the thought and aim of the book in which they occur. This is as if the Bible were a scrap-book or a grab bag, in which, by some mysterious providence, a lot of good things had come together to be taken out at random, as some happy fancy might dictate, for pious uses. What should we say of an expounder of the philosophy of Plato, who should attempt to teach us the system of that great thinker by giving us some reflections based upon isolated passages selected at random from his writings? What should we say of such a teacher, if he had never really studied a single work of Plato as a complete whole, so that he did not himself know the relation of his passages to the works from which they were taken? Or what should we say of a physician who should undertake to cure us of a serious sickness, by using prescriptions selected at random from his text-books on Therapeutics? These men we should call quacks: and justly.

We ought never to forget that the Bible is not so truly to be termed revelation, as the history and product of revelation. Facts have always preceded books, if the books have been good for anything. This has been the case also with the Bible books. The New Testament, for example, did not produce Jesus and the church; but Jesus and the church produced the New Testament. Our religion is not the religion of a book, as has been sometimes urged against it; but a religion resting upon historic facts. There is a very important sense in which it still remains the religion for all men and all times, books or no books, inspiration or no inspiration. It is to be remembered that the church was in full being, and men were believing unto salvation in Jesus, before a line of the New Testament was written. The books of the Bible thus had a natural birth out of the needs of men, and the desire of other men to help them; and they were designed by their authors to meet the circumstances of their own time. We cannot reasonably suppose that Isaiah of Jerusalem, when rebuking King Ahaz, or encouraging King Hezekiah, or thundering against the sins of Judah in his day, thought very much of how men would regard his utterances, in 1890 A.D. Or that Paul stopped to consider long how fully he was inspired, when out of a heart hot with grief and indignation, he wrote his burning words to the churches of Galatia; or when, in tender love, he wrote such sweet words of deep affection to his brethren at Philippi. Not in any sense, or in any way, that these words, each and all, were not the words of men moved by the Holy Spirit. But they were also the words of men moved by human occasion and purpose, only rightly to be understood when studied as a part of the world's literature. But that the Bible is literature is a fact which the International System of Sunday-school Lessons seems to leave out of account almost altogether. Its skip-and-jump method is not sufficiently remedied by directions to read what lies between the passages chosen. Even were all this read and studied in the manner in which the selected passages are expounded, still almost no prominence would even then be given to the literary element in the Bible. But this must be constantly before us in any true study of the Scriptures.

In the third place, true Bible study will be historical.

That is, the Bible must not only be studied as books, but as a historical unit—the product and the picture of a developing revelation. Revelation is indeed a unit; but it is also a development. Any true and real meaning of the word revelation must include not only a giving by God, but a receiving by man. To him who receives nothing, nothing can, in any intelligent sense, be said to be revealed. But human receptivity for truth, in the race as in the individual, in the progress from childhood to manhood, has increased by a gradual growth. Revelation, also, to keep pace with the increasing receptivity of man, has been a development. Thus there is a historic order and progress in doctrine in the Bible itself, as well as in the life of the church. Abraham did not see all the truth that was known to Samuel; nor Samuel all that was known by Peter and John. The kingdom of God was one thing to Moses, a somewhat different thing to Isaiah, and another thing yet to Jesus. The hopes for the future that Isaiah had were not the same as those which Paul sets before us in Ephesians and Colossians. Not that the earlier views and hopes were contradicted by the later, but they were less full and perfect.

It is this historical element in revelation which makes it necessary that a scientific study of the Bible should recognize a Biblical theology as a true and necessary basis for a Christian, and a Baptist theology, and yet as distinct from the latter. Historical theology and systematic theology may both be Biblical, and ought both to be Biblical; but they are not the same thing, for all that. To read into, or out of, a passage in the Psalms or Isaiah the same meaning as if it had been written by John or Paul, even were every word the same in both cases, may be the practice of even some Baptists; but it is neither science nor common sense. The scientific value of many of the proof passages of our systems of doctrine would be found to be absolutely lost, if due regard were paid to the place of these passages in the development of revelation. In this matter, also, our International System of Lessons seems to me to be radically at fault. If the reply be made that this idea of the historical element in revelation cannot be taught to all grades of minds, one may well ask, then, why seek to have as the one system for all minds, in the school of the church, a system which is sure to convey a radically false idea to the minds that are able to receive the truth about the divine revelation?

A failure to recognize the presence and results of the historic element in the Bible, the development in revelation, if it is really there, will introduce a large percentage of error into the results to which any study of the Scriptures will lead us.

The just conclusion, then, seems to be that the time has come for this International System of Bible study, which is opposed to modern educational ideas, and is not able to satisfy the demands of scientific interpretation, to give place to something else, better fitted to survive.

HAMILTON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Hamilton, N. Y.

THE JESUS CHRIST OF THE KORAN.

BY THE REV. S. M. ZWEMER.

From *The Christian Intelligencer* (Reformed Dutch), New York, November 29, 1890.

AUTHORITIES widely differ as to what were the real sources from which Mohammed drew his historic material for the composition of the Koran. Yet, whatever those sources may have been, Jewish, Gnostic, or Christian, the contents of the book prove beyond a doubt that some of these sources must have been in the main accurate, although much corrupted in their adoption or by their accommodation to the new system. Islam is in some respects a palimpsest of early Arabian Christianity; and if we look beneath the accumulated traditions and corruptions of his followers, and beneath the often incoherent rhapsodies of Mohammed himself, we can see more than dim traces of such Christian concepts as prevailed with the apostle of Arabia. In all missionary effort it is important to know the soil as well as the seed; and in working for Islam, to know what they think of Christ, before we present Christ to them, is not only prudent, but essential.

As Islam is based upon and always finds final proof for its doctrine in the Koran, that book alone can give us the earliest and truest conception among Muslims of the character of Jesus Christ. Following the usual theological analysis of the text-books of Christian doctrine, what did Mohammed teach on the *Person, Offices* and *States* of the Messiah?

His Person. Though, as is well known, the Koran repeatedly and unequivocally denies the deity of Jesus, the son of Mary, as we understand it (Surahs 2 : 112 ; 19 : 43, etc.), yet certain attributes are assigned to Christ and names given Him, which Mohammed himself acknowledges could only belong to God, and which he did not, therefore, even in his later and most arrogant revelations, claim for himself. Such, for example, are the names : *Al Messiah* (Surah 3 : 40), *The Word of God* (4 : 169), *Spirit from God* (4 : 169) ; or the attribute of sinlessness which Mohammed never did claim for himself, but which he credits to Jesus the son of Mary, according to the tradition of Anas (Mishkat, book XXIII., chapter 12).

As to Christ's humanity, the Koran acknowledges His miraculous conception and birth. It gives a warped and fantastic account of his life, in which the human element is always prominent, though it is always accompanied by the power of working miracles, and thus shows a divine authority and commission. The third Surah assigns to Christ the power to create, to heal, to cleanse lepers and to raise the dead (vs. 43–46). In the fifth Surah it is stated that God " will chastise" those who believe not in Jesus Christ " with a chastisement wherewith I will not chastise any other creature" (vs. 112–115). Christ's offices, as set forth in the Koran, throw further light on His real mission and power as taught by Mohammed.

His Offices. We find both the prophetical and kingly offices of Christ plainly admitted, if not in all their Christian fulness, yet with undoubted words. He is called a prophet in many places. Of the three hundred and fifteen prophets, or apostles, spoken of by Mohammed, six are dignified by special names—Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Mohammed. Jesus is called the *Ruhu Allah*, Spirit of God. To Him was committed, and He taught, the *Ingil*, or Gospel. Christ's mission was to the Jews. He came " to confirm the law, and as a guidance and warning to those who fear God" (Surah 5 : 50). Jesus had " clear proofs of this mission," and was " strengthened by the Holy Spirit" (Surah 2 : 81, 254). He taught among the Jews and confirmed His teaching by signs, but they did not believe.

That Jesus was crucified is denied by the Koran (Surahs 3 : 47–50 ; 4 : 155, 156), and the well-known fiction, perhaps borrowed from the Gospel of Barnabas, that Judas was crucified in His stead is substituted. The kingly office of Christ is not so clearly stated as His prophetical work, and yet no less taught by implication. He is called " Illustrious in this world and the next" (Surah 3 : 40) ; His miracles admit royal power ; the following words, which certainly suggest His kingship, are ascribed to Christ (Surah 3 : 44), " I come to you with a sign from God. Fear God and *obey me*;" and finally His power at judgment is that of a king, as well as His exaltation in heaven (Surah 4 : 157). That Christ is a priest could not by any means of interpretation be forced from the Koran or tradition. That vital office which dignifies His work as prophet and glorifies His kingship is absent in Mohammedan Christology. As Sale puts it, " The Cross of Christ is the missing link in the Moslem's Creed ; for we have in Islam the strange anomaly of a religion which rejects the doctrine of sacrifice for sin, while its great central feast is a feast of sacrifice." And yet that anomaly of Islam will once be the glory of Christianity when Christian missions will use that great central sacrificial feast at Mecca as convincing proof with Moslems of the necessity of the doctrine of atonement ; and so Islam's centre of power will testify against Islam.

The States of Christ. The Koran here is not as explicit as are the traditions based on it. Of course, by denying the deity of the Messiah, His glory and power from all eternity are also denied, and His miraculous conception and birth become a mere passivity like the creation of Adam. There can be no humiliation unless there be a Son of God. However, that element of humiliation embraced in the *life* of Christ while on earth is to some extent taught. Some Surahs speak of His poverty, and of His persecution and rejection by the Jews. His priestly office not even being hinted at, and His vicarious and expiatory death being denied, the humiliation and suffering of Gethsemane and Golgotha remain excluded from the Koran. As to Christ's exaltation, all Moslems admit that Jesus was miraculously (by deception !) (Surah 4 : 156) taken to heaven, and did not see death or corruption. Mohammed says he saw Jesus and John in the second heaven ; others name the third or fourth heaven as His place of abode. The Koran is apparently silent, but tradition based on Surah 4 : 157 holds that Christ is coming again for judgment. "And there shall not be one of the people of the Book but shall believe in Him (Jesus) ; before His death and in the day of judgment He shall be a witness against them" (4 : 157). After the judgment there will be a sort of carnal millennium. Jesus will live on earth forty-five years, marry and have children, and then again die ; wealth will abound, and enmity and hatred cease.

Such is our outline of the character of Jesus and of His mission, as given in the Koran. It is too barren and blasphemous to be called a portrait ; it contains too much truth to be stamped a caricature. Aside from criticism, may we not draw two conclusions from its study : 1. That the Christ of the Koran is not the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world ; and yet, 2. That this Christ of the Koran may be used to point those who know Him to the "fulness of the Godhead" in the Gospels. That showing to Islam its need of salvation by conviction of sin, corrects and completes Islam's picture of the Saviour of the world. "*Him, therefore, whom ye ignorantly worship, declare we unto you.*"

BEYROUT, Syria.

A HOME MISSIONARY'S HARDSHIPS.

From *The Moravian*, Bethlehem, Pa., December 3, 1890.

WITH the commencement of the bleak winter season, it may be well for Christians housed in comfortable homes, amid the conveniences of town or city life, to think of the home missionary's lot, as a pioneer of the Gospel in the sparsely settled districts of the far West. We do not now have in mind so much those pecuniary embarrassments which arise from a scanty salary and its irregular receipt. Home missionaries are not the only ministers of our own, or of other churches, acquainted with that sort of thing. Many a preacher in Eastern cities finds it hard to comply with the injunction to show hospitality, or even to abide by that other apostolic exhortation, to owe no man anything. In this the lot of the home missionary is not unique, though there are often bright times too for him, as there are for other ministers of the gospel.

We have in mind, rather, the peculiar trials arising from the very nature of his field of labor. Often he serves two or more widely separated congregations. His people live at long distances apart. In addition to preaching at the regular places of worship, he feels compelled by circumstances to maintain services at outlying school-houses, or at remote farms. Only thus can the entire circle of people who have a claim upon him, and for whose welfare he is yearning, be served with the Gospel. In new sections of the country the roads are never too good ; and winter and spring sometimes see them impassable. The Lord's Day under these conditions calls for an amount of physical exertion, and entails a nervous strain that may tell on the stoutest constitution. During the week much driving in the night air is almost inevitable if the home missionary is faithful and energetic, for prayer-meetings must be maintained at various points.

Cases exist, also, where the good brother must eke out his salary by being the school-teacher for the community or congregation during the week ; and must in a certain period of the year lengthen his never too short hours of teaching, in order to give special religious instruction to the candidates for confirmation. Possibly, even beyond and above all this, he is expected to obtain part of his subsistence and that of his family, from the cultivation of a patch of land. Where he finds time for study and intellectual growth as a minister must be somewhat of a mystery, if he is hampered by the above conditions of life.

Withal, in those communities where a home missionary generally finds his field, few experienced Christian workers are to be found. The minister must be in the forefront, the head and leader not only in the Church, but also in the various spheres of public charity and in schemes for the advancement of the intellectual and moral tone of the community at large. Unless he is a man of affairs, he will often be made to feel at a decided disadvantage.

And yet opposition to religion and to Christian organizations is apt to be outspoken and reckless in new communities to an extent unknown in the older parts of the land, where propriety exacts silence and transmutes dislike into indifference, even though a contempt of religion may lurk beneath the surface. In the field where the home missionary labors, many more men will be found who seem to experience no sense of shame in championing irreligion or in exhibiting profanity. The fight in which he is engaged is, therefore, apt to be peculiarly severe. The responsibility of successfully maintaining his championship of the Gospel of Christ is constantly present, and often rests upon him anxiously, as he faces new combinations of wickedness and new devices of bad men.

With it all he is not always made to feel that the Church at his back, the Church which has sent him to do pioneer work, is loyally appreciative of his firm fidelity and cheerful self-denial. And this feeling may be as severe a foe of his usefulness as any of those enumerated before. To be convinced that the mass of his fellow-Christians who bear the same name with him regard his honest endeavors and hard struggles with unconcern may unnerve and weaken him far more than do the discouragements which he faces in the front.

Brethren, let us deprive *our* home missionaries of any feeling that we are indifferent to their self-sacrificing labors of love. They themselves are worthy of every sign of our appreciation. Their work is in a line with that of their comrades in other Churches, which is the hope of our country's future. To the home missionaries the great West owes, and will in the end owe, more than it does to the pioneers of commercial enterprises. And for the future of our own Church in particular, the success of their efforts is essential. We must go forward. We dare not go back. We cannot stand still. Stagnation means slow death.

Let us all loyally do our very best for our home missionaries personally, and aid in mitigating those of their hardships that can be mitigated from a distance. Though the writer can write only from observation, he knows whereof he writes, when he depicts the hardship and withal the importance of their work. By helping to sustain them individually and by faithfully supporting the entire enterprise of which they are the working force, we shall be doing the Lord's work in a way acceptable to Him Who came to seek and to save the lost.

BIBLICAL RESEARCH.

A New Akkadian Story of the Creation.

BY THEODORE G. PINCHES, OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

From *The Independent*, New York, December 4, 1890.

Passing rich has been the harvest which has rewarded the laborers in the domain of Assyrian research, and even now the whole is not reaped. Who would have thought that, in addition to the two legends of the Creation now known to have existed with the Babylonians and Assyrians, another would be found? Yet it is so; and this third legend of the Creation possesses a special interest, for it is written not only in Semitic Babylonian, but also in the Akkadian language. It forms, in fact, the introductory part of a bilingual incantation, and, as such, has a distinctly Akkadian impress. It may therefore be regarded as a special and independent version which originated, at a very early period, with that nation.

The tablet bearing this important record is of baked clay, and was found by Mr. Rassam at Kouyunjik in 1882. The writing is in the Babylonian style, and is very small and close. The lower portion of the obverse and the upper portion of the reverse is broken away, but the most important part of the text is well preserved, as the following translation will show:

TRANSLATION.

The glorious house, the house of the gods, in a glorious place had not been made;
A plant had not grown, a tree had not been formed;
A brick had not been laid, a beam had not been shaped;
A house had not been built, a city had not been contructed;
A city had not been built, a foundation had not been gloriously made;
Niffer had not been built, E-kura had not been constructed;
Erech had not been built, E-ana had not been constructed;
The abyss had not been made, Eridu had not been built;
(As for) the glorious house, the house of the gods, its seat had not been constructed;
The whole of the lands and the sea also,
When within the sea there was a stream.

In that day Eridu was built, E-sagila was constructed,
E-sagila which the god Lugal-du-azaga founded within the abyss.
Babylon was built, E-sagila was completed.
He made the gods and the Anunnaki altogether.
The glorious city, the seat of the joy of their heart, he proclaimed supremely.
Merodach bound together the *amam* before the water;
He made dust, and poured it out with the flood.
The gods were to be made to dwell in a seat of joy of heart.
He made mankind.
Aruru, the seed of mankind, they made with him.
The beasts of the field, the living creatures of the desert he made.
He made and set in their place the Tigris and the Euphrates;
Well proclaimed be their name.
The *ussu*-plant, the *dittu*-plant of the marshland, the reed, and the forest he made;
He made the verdure of the desert;
The lands, the marshes, the greensward also.
The ox, the young of the horse, the stallion, the heifer, the sheep, the locust
Plantation and forest also
The he-goat and the gazelle came before (?) him.
The lord Merodach on the sea-shore filled up a mound
. . . . . formerly had not been
. . . . he caused to be
[He caused the plant to grow], he made the tree
. . . . . he made in its place
[He laid the brick], he shaped the beam
[He built the house], he built the city.
[He built a city], he made the foundation gloriously.
He built [Niffer, the city of] the temple E-kura
[He built Erech, the city of the temple E-ana].

* * * * * * *

In this collection of rough-and-ready statements we miss the usual symmetry of arrangement of the acts of creation into periods, so excellently shown in the opening chapter of the Bible, and, to a much less degree, in the Babylonian story first given to the world of to-day by the late George Smith. There is no mention of the heavens or of the heavenly bodies, and there is not even a statement as to the creation of the earth, though some such condition as

"When on high the heavens proclaimed not,
Beneath the earth recorded not a name"

(as the other Babylonian version has it) is implied by the opening lines. It begins with the time when the earth was waste and desert, and when the glorious cities and temples so dear to the Babylonian heart had not yet been built. Merodach poses as the great creator, and does not seem to divide the honor with Tiamat (who, however, was probably only regarded as the producer of the lower forms of life). Not only did Niffer and Erech, with their great temple E-kura ("the house of the earth"), and E-ana ("the house of heaven") not exist, but Eridu ("the good city") and the abyss, apparently corresponding with paradise and hades, were still things of the future, and the home of the gods was as yet unmade. "When within the sea there was a stream (*inu-sa kirib tâmtim ratumma*) in that day Eridu was built, E-sagila was constructed—E-sagila which Lugal-du-azaga founded within the abyss." (*E-sagila sa ina kirib apsî Lugal du azaga irmû.*) This E-sagila, or "house of the high head," the name of a celebrated temple town at Babylon, was apparently the extra-terrestrial prototype of the latter. Then comes the building of Babylon, and *after that*, the creation of the gods and the Anunnaki (or spirit of the earth), the city of the gods, and the making of the land. The creation of mankind, the seed of mankind (apparently personified by the god Aruru), the animals, the rivers Tigris and Euphrates, plants, the different kinds of land, etc., and lastly, the cities Niffer and Erech, all by Merodach, follow in strange medley.

Uncouth as the diction is, this version of the Creation-legend has a fair amount of importance. Distinctively Akkadian, it treats of things from an Akkadian point of view. There is no appearance of any violent contest between chaos and the heavenly powers, such as we meet with in the account in Smith's "Chaldean Genesis." A legend originating among a people who loved peace, it tries to explain those things which interested themselves, and it treats of these things in its own way.

DR. LIDDON'S WILL.

From *The Church Times*, London, November 14, 1890.

THE value of the personal estate of the late Dr. Liddon has been sworn at £47,226. The will, dated November 24th, 1885, begins: "First, I commit my soul into the hands of Almighty God, trusting to obtain His mercy only through the merits of Jesus Christ, and firmly believing the Christian faith as held by the whole Catholic Church before the division of East and West and by the Church of England." It was the testator's desire to be buried in the crypt of St. Paul's Cathedral. He bequeaths to Canon Paget, the Rev. Charles Gore, librarian of the Pusey Library, and the Rev. J. O. Johnston, of Keble College, all his manuscripts and letters, trusting to them, in conjunction with his sisters, Mrs. King and

Mrs. Gibson Ambrose, to destroy such as should be destroyed, with liberty to publish or arrange for the publication, should it not be already completed, of the Life of Dr. Pusey, "bearing in mind," the testator adds, "that my present notes are not, in my judgment, ready or fit for publication as they stand." His theological, historical, and liturgical books Canon Liddon bequeaths to Keble College Library. He bequeaths to the Trustees of the Pusey Memorial all books having the name or handwriting of Dr. Pusey, and all letters to the testator from the Rev. J. Keble or Cardinal Newman, for the library of Pusey House, and in the case of all books given by him to the Pusey, Keble, or other Library, he desires that a plate or inscription to that effect shall be inserted in them by the librarians of such institutions respectively. Canon Liddon bequeaths £500 each to his brothers Edward and John, as executors of his will; £1000 to his cousin, the Rev. Henry John Liddon; £1000 to the Warden of Keble College and Mr. J. A. Shaw-Stewart, to add to the endowment of the Scholarship in Keble College recently founded by the testator for the encouragement of the study of divinity; £1000 to Lord Beauchamp and Lord Halifax, to add to the capital of the Pusey Memorial Fund; £250 to the Bishop of Colombo, for the purposes of his diocese; £250 to the Missionary Bishop in Central Africa, for the general work of the Mission, or, if desirable, toward a cathedral church at Zanzibar; £250 to the Bishop of Lincoln, for the Oxford Mission to Calcutta; £250 to the Bishop of Oxford, for the purchase of works of the Catholic Fathers for Cuddesdon College; and £250 to All Saints' School, Bloxham, for the purchase of works of the Ancient Fathers of the Catholic Church of Christ, or of the Rev. Dr. Pusey or the Rev. John Keble. There are legacies to all the testator's servants. The residuary estate is divided among the brothers and sisters of the deceased.

THE LATEST RESULTS OF ORIENTAL ARCHÆOLOGY.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, LL.D.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), December, 1890.

A YEAR ago I gave a short account of the startling archæological discoveries which had just been made in Arabia. The explorations of Doughty, Euting, Huber, and above all, Glazer, the inscriptions they had found, and the historical facts disclosed by the decipherment of the epigraphic material, have thrown a sudden and unexpected flood of light on a continent which has hitherto been darker even than Central Africa. The members of the last Oriental Congress heard with astonishment that a country which had been supposed to be little more than a waste of sand and rock, inhabited by wandering nomads, and first appearing on the page of history in the time of Mohammed, had really been a centre of light and culture in remote ages—a land of active trade and commerce, which once exercised an important influence on the civilized world of the ancient East, and possessed an alphabetic system of writing earlier, it would seem, than that which we know as the Phœnician alphabet.

I was able to give only a brief outline of the results that had been announced by scholars in the new field of research. A large portion of the inscriptions on which they were based had not been published, and the work promised by Dr. Glaser, on the ancient geography of Arabia, had not appeared.[*] Moreover, there had not yet been time for the special students of Arabian history and epigraphy to criticise the conclusions at which scholars like Professor D. H. Müller, or Dr. Glaser had arrived.[†]

A year has passed, and we have now had time to take a sober review of the new discoveries, and examine their weak points. In one respect, the history of ancient Arabia which I laid before the readers of the CONTEMPORARY REVIEW must be modified. Professor D. H. Müller was too hasty in ascribing an early date to the inscriptions of Lihhyân in Northern Arabia. Instead of belonging to the tenth, or even the seventh, century before our era, it is now evident that they are not earlier than the fall of the Roman Empire. They are strongly influenced by the religious ideas and technical terms of Judaism, and belong to the period when Jewish colonies and Jewish proselytism were rapidly extending through Arabia. The kingdom of Lihhyân rose and decayed at no long interval of time before the birth of Mohammed.

On the other hand, further study has gone to confirm Dr. Glaser's view of the great antiquity of the Minæan kingdom, and of the spread of its power from the south of Arabia to the frontiers of Egypt and Palestine.

---

[*] Dr. Glaser's large and learned volume on the ancient geography of Arabia has now been published ("Skizze der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens," vol. ii., Berlin: Weidmann), and contains a wealth of information on subjects like the site of Ophir, or the geographical knowledge of Ptolemy.

[†] "Skizze der Geschichte Arabiens," Part I. Munich Straub.

There can be no doubt that it preceded the rise of the kingdom of Saba, the Sheba of the Old Testament. There was no room for the contemporaneous existence of the two monarchies; geographically they covered the same area, and the cities of Saba were embedded, as it were, within the territory of Ma'in. But the Sabæan cities flourished at the expense of those of Ma'in, and later tradition forgot even the names of the old Minæan towns.

The kingdom of Saba was already flourishing when Tiglath-Pileser and Sargon ruled over Assyria, in the eighth century B.C. And not only was it flourishing, its power had extended far to the North, where the Assyrian monarchs came into contact with its king. The visit of the Queen of Sheba to Solomon carries back the foundation of the Sabæan monarchy to a still earlier date. Unless we are to suppose that the visit is the invention of a later writer, we must conclude that nearly ten centuries before the Christian era Saba had already superseded Ma'in, and that the old kingdom, with its trade and culture, its fortified cities and inscribed walls, had already passed away. The fact would explain why it is that classical writers know only of a Minænn people, not of a Minæan kingdom, and that even in the pages of the Old Testament, while references occur to Sheba, only a careful search can detect the name of Ma'in.

Dr. Glaser has shown that the "kings" of Saba were preceded by the Makârib, or "high-priests" of Saba. Here, as in other parts of the Semitic world, the priest-king was the predecessor of the merely secular king. The State was originally regarded as a theocracy, and it was some time before the priest and the king became separated from one another. We are reminded of the history of Israel, as well as of Jethro, the "priest of Midian." As in Assyria, where there were "high-priests of Assur" before there were "kings of Assyria," the State was represented by a deity whose name it bore, or who derived his name from the State. Saba, like Assur, must once have been a god.

We are already acquainted with the names of thirty-three Minæan Sovereigns. Three of them have been found by Professor Müller in inscriptions from the neighbourhood of Teima, the Tema of the Old Testament, in Northern Arabia, on the road to Damascus and Sinai. Their authority, therefore, was not confined to the original seat of Minæan power in the South, but was felt throughout the length of the Arabian peninsula. The fact is confirmed by an interesting inscription copied by Halévy in Southern Arabia, which has been deciphered by Professor Hommel and Dr. Glaser. It tells us that it was engraved by its authors in gratitude for their rescue by Athtar and other deities "from the war which took place between the ruler of the land of the South, and the ruler of the land of the North," as well as "from the midst of Egypt)*Mitsr*) in the conflict which took place between Madhi and Egypt," and for their safe restoration to their own city of Qarnu. The authors of the inscription, Ammi-tsadiq and Sa'd, further state that they lived under the Minæan King, Abi-yada' Yathi', and that they were "the two governors of Tsar and Ashur and the further bank of the river."

Professor Hommel has pointed out that in Ashur we have an explanation of the Asshurim of the Bible, who are called the sons of Dedan (Gen. xxv. 3, 18), while Tsar must be a fortress often mentioned on the Egyptian monuments as guarding the approach to Egypt, on what would now be the Arabian side of the Suez Canal. Madhi Dr. Glaser would identify with Mizzah the grandson of Esau (Gen. xxxvi. 17), but the other references in the inscription are obscure. It proves, however, that the power of the Minæan princes was acknowledged as far as the borders of Egypt, in what Professor Hommel believes to have been the age of the Hyksos; that their authority was recognized in Edom is shown by an inscription in which mention is made of Gaza.

It would thus appear that Palestine, or at all events the tribes immediately surrounding it, were in close contact with a civilized power which had established trade routes from the South, and protected them from the attacks of the nomad Beduin. The part now performed, or supposed to be performed by Turkey, was performed before the days of Solomon by the princes and merchants of Ma'in. A conclusion of unexpected interest follows this discovery. The Minæans were a literary people; they used an alphabetic system of writing, and set up their inscriptions, not only in their Southern homes, but also in their colonies in the North. If their records really mount back to the age now claimed for them—and it is difficult to see where counter-arguments are to come from—they will be far older than the oldest known inscription in Phœnician letters. Instead of deriving the Minæan alphabet from the Phœnician, we must derive the Phœnician alphabet from the Minæan, or from one of the Arabian alphabets of which the Minæan was the mother; instead of seeking in Phœnicia the primitive home of the alphabets of our modern world, we shall have to look for it in Arabia. Canon Isaac Taylor, in his "History of the Alphabet," had already found himself compelled by palæographic evidence to assign a much earlier date to the alphabet of South Arabia than that which had previously been ascribed to it, and the discoveries of Glaser and Hommel show that he was right.

As soon as we reverse the problem and assume that the Phœnician alphabet is later instead of earlier than the Minæan, we obtain an explanation of much that has hitherto been puzzling. The names given to many of the Phœnician letters are at last found to agree with the forms of the latter. It is only in the South Arabian alphabets, for instance, that the letter called *pê*, "the mouth," our *P*, has the form of a mouth, or that the first letter *aleph*, "an ox," really resembles the head of that animal. Moreover, we can now understand how it is that the South Arabian alphabets possess letters which do not occur in the Phœnician alphabet, and are not derived from any of the Phœnician characters. The Phœnician language had lost certain sounds which comparative philology has shown belonged to the Semitic Parent-Speech, and which were preserved in the languages of Arabia. That these sounds should have been represented by special symbols in the Arabian alphabets, if the latter had been borrowed from the defective alphabet of Phœnicia, is unintelligible; in such a case the symbols would have been modifications of other symbols already existing in the alphabet, or else the same symbol would have been allowed to express more than one sound. This has actually happened in Hebrew, where the same symbols stand respectively for *'ain* and *ghain*, for *s* and *sh*. There can be but one explanation of the fact that the Arabian alphabets denote by independent symbols certain sounds which had been lost in Phœnician pronunciation; the Arabian alphabets are more primitive than the alphabet of Phœnicia. When the latter first comes before us, it is in a comparatively late and conventionalized form, widely removed from the hieratic characters of Egypt, out of which it is commonly supposed to have been developed.

The discovery of the antiquity of writing among the populations of Arabia cannot fail to influence the views that have been current of late years in regard to the earlier history of the Old Testament. We have hitherto taken it for granted that the tribes to whom the Israelites were related were illiterate nomads, and that in Midian or Edom the invaders of Palestine would have had no opportunity of making acquaintance with books and written records. Before the time of Samuel and David it has been strenuously maintained that letters were unknown in Israel. But such assumptions must now be considerably modified. The ancient Oriental world, even in Northern Arabia, was a far more literary one than we have been accustomed to imagine; and as for Canaan, the country in which the Israelites settled, fought, and intermarried, we now have evidence that education was carried in it to a surprisingly high point. In the principal cities of Palestine an active literary correspondence was not only carried on, but was maintained by means of a foreign language, and an extremely complicated script. There must have been plenty of schools and teachers, as well as of pupils and books.

The latest revelation that has been furnished to us by the tablets of Telel-Amarna relates to Jerusalem. Among the tablets now in the Museum of Berlin, five have been found which prove, upon examination, to have been letters sent from the King or Governor of Jerusalem to the Egyptian Sovereigns in the century before the exodus. The Governor in question was named Abdi-dhaba, or Ebed-tob, as his name would have been written in Hebrew. He describes himself as occupying a more independent position than the governors of most of the other towns of Palestine. They were merely Egyptian officials; he, on the other hand, though he owned allegiance to the Egyptian monarch, nevertheless claims to have derived his power from "the oracle of the mighty king." As one of the letters shows that this "mighty king" was not the king of Egypt, but a deity, we are irresistibly reminded of Melchizedek the king of Salem, and priest of "the most high God," from whom therefore the king derived his authority. Last spring I had already recognized the name of "Urusalim" or Jerusalem in one of the Telel-Amarna tablets at Cairo, and one of those which I copied in the collection of M. Bouriant tells us what was the local name of the "most high God." The tablet is unfortunately broken; but on one side of it we read: "The city of the mountain of Jerusalem, the city of the temple of the god Uras, (whose) name (there is) Marru, the city of the king which adjoins (?) the locality of the men of Keilah."

Marru seems to be the same word as the Aramaic *marê*, "lord"; he was identified with the Babylonian Uras, and his temple stood on "the mountain" which was called Moriah, perhaps in remembrance of the god. Long before the days when Solomon built the temple of Yahveh the spot on which it stood had been the site of a hallowed sanctuary.

The tablets at Berlin refer to transactions which had taken place between Addi-dhaba and the "Kassi" or Babylonians, and in one of them an oracle of the god of Jerusalem is quoted which declared that, "so long as a ship crosses the sea—this (is) the oracle of the mighty king—so long shall the conquests continue of Nahrima and the Babylonians." Since Nahrima is the Aram-Naharaim of the Old Testament, light is thrown on the account which is given us in the Book of Judges of the eight-years' occupation of Southern Palestine by the king of that country. In Chushan-rishathaim we must see a successor of the princes whose conquests were proclaimed by the oracle on Moriah. It was an anticipation of the career which Balaam predicted for "the star of Jacob."

Light is also thrown on a statement of the Egyptian historian, Manetho, which it has been the fashion to treat with scant respect. He tells us that when the Hyksos were expelled from Egypt they built Jerusalem, as a defence—not against the Egyptians, as would naturally be expected—but against "the Assyrians." In the age of Manetho "Assyrians" and "Babylonians" were synonymous terms.

But though it is to the tablets of Telel-Amarna that we must look for light upon the history of the Canaan which the tribes of Israel invaded, it is rather from the monumental records of ancient Arabia that we may expect to draw our chiefest illustrations of the inner life and belief of the invading tribes themselves. One of these illustrations has already been indicated by Professor Hommel.* In one of the Arabian inscriptions discovered by Euting we find the word *law'ân* used in the sense of "priests." The word is etymologically the same as the Hebrew Levi; and when we remember that Jethro, the priest of Midian, watched, as it were, over the birth of the Israelitish priesthood, and had as his son-in-law the Levite Moses, there opens out for us, as Professor Hommel remarks, "a new and unexpected perspective in the history of religion."

THE GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY.

BY W. R. HUNTINGTON, D.D., D.C.L.

From *The Sunday School Times*, Philadelphia, December 13, 1890.

The Christmas angels open their announcements with an exhortation not to be afraid. It is strange that we should have to be cautioned against fright when it is a question of "good" tidings. Fear is not a feeling that commonly enters into our anticipations of what is pleasant. Messengers of calamity we dread, but the bringers of such news as is good we welcome. And yet, looking back, we find it to have been the case that each of the two very best announcements ever made to man had to be ushered in with a "Fear not."

Both the angel who tells that Christ is born, and the angel who tells that Christ is risen, has this preface on his lips. They seem to have thought that they had no chance of getting audience unless first they could allay alarm.

The reason is not far to seek. We fear what is unusual—out of the common. It was a new thing to those men of Bethlehem to see heaven opened. They were not accustomed in their night watches to have the darkness lightened without warning. Dangers there were, no doubt, on that hill-side of theirs; robbers and wolves they had to guard against as best they might; but these were perils of an earthly and familiar sort. But who could know what disaster might be hidden under the approach of a visitor whose very voice and raiment were of a startling sort? Who could say what deadly influence might, or might not, lurk in the strange light that threw such sudden glory over turf and sheep?

The key to the significance of the whole passage lies in what the angel and his associates say. The shepherds interest us by their *naïveté*, but have nothing of moment to communicate. They are the pupils, not the teachers. The stress should be laid wholly on the angelic utterances. In other words, the doctrine of the Word made flesh is the real lesson of Christmas.

The Son of God became the Son of Mary in order that heaven might cease to be the dim, uncertain thing it had been, and that the King of heaven might cease to seem the very distant potentate he had seemed. This is the special felicity that attaches to the religion called the gospel. Without at all derogating from the awfulness of God, without impairing in the least degree the brightness of the divine majesty, it does yet succeed in making deity a veritable God-with-us. Nowadays, when we are so often bidden, sometimes petulantly, sometimes scornfully, sometimes bitterly, to surrender our confident loyalty toward him who was "conceived by the Holy Ghost," at the cost, unless we do so, of being sent to the rear, among the ignorant, the cowardly, and the stupid, it is a helpful thing to study the contrast which this aspect of the faith affords to whatever in the present is offered, or ever has been offered in the past, as a substitute for what we believe.

---

* "Aufsätze und Abhandlungen zur Kunde der Sprachen, Literaturen und der Geschichte des vorderen Orients." Munich.

Take the heathen religions, ancient and modern. Can it be truly said of them that their first word to man, or, for that matter, their last word, is "Fear not"? On the contrary, is it not true of them, that their word, first, last, and always, is "Be afraid"? False religion perverts the natural awe men feel in the presence of the great things of God's universe into a superstitious dread; turns wonder at the stars into fear of their malign influence, and translates the voices of the storm into the mutterings of ghostly vengeance. Out of soil thus prepared spring up bloodthirsty idolatries, and all sorts of caricatures of the truth that men ought to fear God. For a truth it is, after all, frightfully distorted as it may have been; and a truth, moreover, which the herald angels at Bethlehem by no means meant to contradict—that men ought to fear God. There is a fear of God which "the thankless and the unholy" do well to entertain, so long as they cling to their thanklessness and unholiness. And again, there is a fear of God which even his reconciled children must always have, so long as they worthily appreciate his majesty—a fear which is the same thing as reverence, and admits of the prefix "holy." In both of these ways, so long as men are what they are, the fear of God must always have a place in religion.

But it is not in these ways at all that the false religions call on men to fear their deities. The priest of an idolatry says: "Here is this great god, whose image we keep in our temple, and who does what we ask him to do. You have offended him." "How?" asks the worshipper. "By anything wrong that I have done? By lying, by cheating, by cruelty, or drunkenness?" "Oh, no! He cares nothing for matters of that sort. You have offended him by not paying proper tribute to us, his priests. Atone for this, or presently we shall tell the god to spoil your harvests, or disappoint you in the chase." The false religion, that is to say, seeks to make people fear God for reasons the very opposite of those for which they ought to fear him. The true faith teaches that the heavenly Father is one who delights to bless, and who punishes only when, and in so far as, righteousness makes it necessary; while the idolater worships a god of whom he believes that he will certainly do him all the harm he can, unless by some means he shall meanwhile be bribed or cajoled into doing otherwise.

What is more to the point, Christian people themselves take this same heathenish ground when they credit divine Providence with all the hard and disagreeable and troublesome and afflictive things that come into their lives, and never once truly from the heart thank God for sending the good things as well. This is strictly and accurately heathenish; for the heathen is not a heathen in that he fears, but in that he fears on mistaken grounds and in a wrong way.

Again, there is the contrast between the gospel way of looking at things, and that which is offered to us as a substitute for it, not by the heathen, but by those who loudly assert for themselves a more generous enlightenment than is enjoyed by the rest of us. We are assured by the nature worshippers that the only reasonable course for man is to reconcile himself as best he may to the iron rule of law. As for the unfortunates who come into the world poorly equipped for the struggle with the forces that continually make war on man from the cradle to the grave, the best wish that we can wish them is that they may yield up, as soon as possible, the existence they are so ill fitted to sustain. And as for our own future, so these new prophets go on to tell us, we know nothing at all about that. Of a life other than this which we are now living, Nature has no word to say; and since she is silent, we must, by necessary consequence, be silent too. Evidently these are tidings that deserve any adjective epithet rather than "good."

From thoughts of this sort born of a partial and one-sided study of the truth of God, the cheerful voices that sound out from Bethlehem recall us. "Fear not," the angel said; "for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people."

"All people" is a large phrase, in no wise suggestive of a restricted blessing. It could not have meant the people who were then living on the earth; for the language is the language of prediction, and to the reach of the future covered by it there is no limit set.

And not only so. Let it be noted that Christmas stands for the presence in all true religion of what we may denominate the genial element. The common instinct of humanity has rightly interpreted this meaning of the day by making it a time of rejoicing and festivity. Christian men have generally agreed in thinking that the coming of Christ, while it did not take the solemnity out of human life, did take gloom out of it, and the horror. They have emphasized this conviction by their keeping of Christmas with mirth and gladness.

If, often and again, it has happened that the merry-making has obscured and put out of mind the spiritual joy, the answer is that such abuse is only what might have been expected, and is no argument against keeping the feast as it ought to be kept.

There is something very winning in this thought that true religion has its genial side. There is great comfort in believing that God is more like man, and heaven more like the most perfect home-life of earth, than people commonly suppose; and Christmas does help us to believe this. When the spirit is overburdened by thoughts of the more awful verities of the faith, or weary with pondering the insoluble problems of man's origin and destiny, there is the same sort of relief in turning to this exquisite picture of the angels and the shepherds which a harebell, or a violet, or a delicate spray of fern, gives the eye, when one catches sight of it springing out of some mossy cleft in the rock at the foot of a great waterfall or on the face of a mountain steep. The cataract or the bluff has filled us with thoughts of our own utter insignificance, we feel cowed, dwarfed, dismayed; but the delicate pencilling of the flower reassures us. The same hand, we say, made both rock and leaf; the same Creator who seemed to frown on us from the greater work seems now to smile upon us in the lesser. In the Child of Bethlehem, Godhead and manhood meet and are knit together. "Is God, then, like this?" we ask, in pleased surprise. "Are the characteristics which so strongly attract us in the person of Jesus really a reflection of deity?" If so, the meeting him may turn out to be better than the meeting with one's dearest friend.

The Saviour of the world born a peasant's child, the King of men cradled in a manger—what satire is there here upon our cheap and vulgar notions of eminence, and yet what tenderness as well! What witness to the heavenly Father's pity for a world ruined by its own pride! What strong assurance that the words of the old prophet are to be fulfilled, and a Messiah born who shall truly bear our griefs and carry our sorrows! Christmas is the smile on God's countenance; let us be glad and rejoice in it with the whole heart.

Grace Church Rectory, New York City.

THE PRESENT STAGE OF THE UNION MOVEMENT.

BY B. B. TYLER.

It is profitable, now and again, to pause in any great reform and take the bearings; discovering, if possible, what progress has been made, and where we are.

In the beginning of the current movement in behalf of Christian union, it was necessary to show the sinfulness of sectarianism. This has been done. All who read the New Testament know that on its pages sectarianism is catalogued with "the works of the flesh." Sectarianism stands alongside of adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, sedition, envy, murder, drunkenness, and revelling. Sectarianism is a sin to be repented of as any other sin. Religious sectarianism is an offence to the Head of the Body. Those who are guilty of this sin shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.

Sectarianism is not necessarily the same as denominationalism. The latter encourages the former, no doubt, but is not identical with it.

The several Protestant denominations represent so many efforts to return to the religion of Jesus, in whole or in part, as he gave it to the world in the beginning and as he would have had it continued to the end of time, after successive apostasies, either in faith or life, or in both.

Much has been gained by the fraternal discussions in which Christians have engaged in the past. An encouraging degree of progress has been made. Generally, now, the sin of sectarianism is confessed and some of the evils of our denominationalism are recognized. There are still, it is true, those who think that the division of believers into separate denominations, with conflicting creeds, and varying customs, and unlike organizations, is a good which may be permitted to continue.

But, believe me, denominationalism is temporary. The Christ did not intend his Church to be divided into denominations. He did not found them, He builded only his Church. Sooner or later this feature of the life of the Church must pass away. While it is not of necessity sinful, as is sectarianism, it ought not to be regarded as the normal and permanent condition of the Church that Jesus saved and for which he gave his life.

But the present issue is concerning the basis of union. The sinfulness of sectarianism is realized and confessed. The desirability of denominationalism is, to say the least, doubted by many. The desirability of a clearer union among believers in Jesus than now exists is affirmed everywhere. The Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, the present method of Sunday-school work, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the Evangelical Alliance, the American Bible Society, the Christian Endeavor Society, etc., etc.—these testify, with one voice, to the desirability of a closer union among believers than exists at the present time. These organizations, also, by bringing Christians to work together, encourage the closer union, the desirability of which they confess.

But what basis of union will please Jesus? This is now the question.

The Church of Christ under the personal ministry of the Apostles was a unit. The believers in Jesus in the beginning were united. The multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul. The unity of the disciples of Christ in that early period pleased Jesus. They occupied a platform that was acceptable to him. These propositions will not be controverted.

The creed of this United Church is plainly written in the New Testament. The creed of the reunited Church is ready made. We are under no necessity to make a creed. The creed of Christ's Church is divine. JESUS IS THE CHRIST THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD. On this creed the Church in Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, Ephesus, Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, rested. This was the creed of the Apostolic Church. It must be the creed of Christ's reunited Church.

The ordinances of Christ's Church are also presented in the New Testament. They are two—baptism and the Lord's Supper. The Church of Christ under the ministry of the Apostles had these ordinances, and these only. What is baptism? For whom is baptism? For what is baptism? What elements are used in the Lord's Supper? For whom is the Lord's Supper? How often ought the Lord's Supper to be observed? The purpose of the Lord's Supper? In a study of these Christian ordinances, these questions come to the front; and they are answered in the New Testament.

What kind of a life would Jesus have each of his disciples live? This is an important question in considering the problem of Christian union. On this subject it is sufficient to say that Jesus is the standard. How did Jesus live? He left us an example. I ought to live every day like Jesus. There can be no *Christian* union while Christians are living unchristianly. And as Christians become more truly Christian, the problem before us will approach a solution. These points, then, are now before the minds of those who are working for the reunion of Christians:—I. The Creed. II. The Ordinances. III. The Life. Let us study the creed, the ordinances, and the life, necessary to Christian union as presented on the bright, clean pages of the New Testament.

NEW YORK.

DO OUR FOREIGN MISSIONARIES LIVE IN LUXURY?

BY REV. E. G. PORTER, D.D.

From *The Advance* (Congregationalist), Chicago, November 20, 1890.

THE question has been raised by the critics. Let us meet it fairly, for there should be nothing to conceal, nothing to apologize for, in so great a work as the missionary enterprise to which the whole Christian church is committed by virtue of its charter.

1. The mode of life and methods of work now generally adopted by our missionaries in foreign lands are the result of a long and varied experience. Seventy-five years ago no one could tell how they would live, nor how they would work. It was enough that the men themselves were consecrated and trustworthy men. They were charged to take the Bread of Life to the perishing, and, in so doing, they were guaranteed a support, just what kind of a support could not then be determined. The church was willing to do its part, whatever it might be, and its messsengers were willing to embark upon their holy errand in the spirit of absolute faith. It was natural that in the preliminary stages some experiments would prove unwise, through excess of zeal or neglect of proper precautions. Precious lives were, no doubt, sacrificed by needless exposure to the tropical sun, by the want of suitable food, by the absence of sanitary arrangements, or by an uninterrupted nervous strain which the conditions of life in the East do not permit.

2. This costly but valuable experience has

given us certain well-established data from which our boards have framed their instructions to the missionaries and estimated their ordinary expenses. The style of living is generally in accordance with those instructions and within the designated appropriations. And it is perfectly well known to all intelligent contributors, for it is described and illustrated, over and over again, in our missionary addresses and publications.

3. Whether or not their style of living should be called luxurious depends wholly upon our definition of that word, and upon other styles of living with which we compare it. Everything in such matters is relative. Compared with the natives in all Eastern countries, our missionaries do undoubtedly live in luxury. Compared with European and American merchants and officials in those countries, they do not. The casual observer might not distinguish between the British officer in India and the missionary. They both are well dressed, well housed and well fed. That is evident. But if you compare the expense of living, you will find that the former spends $5000 or $10,000 a year, and the latter, perhaps, $1000. This is often overlooked.

4. Some unreasonable and unsympathetic travellers have reported that missionaries live like nabobs ; keep servants, horses and carriages, and fare sumptuously every day, far better indeed than the average contributor to the Board, who ignorantly supposes that his missionary is undergoing the greatest privations all the time. The inference is that we must call for a reform, and order our agents to spend less money, to "live more like the people among whom they labor," and to make those commendable sacrifices which harmonize so well with the name of a missionary. Some critics in England are even demanding that celibacy should be required as being a less expensive and more efficient means of propagating the gospel.

5. Before joining in this cry, let us ourselves critically inspect our own well-tried and long-approved methods, and see whether reason or experience require any radical change to avoid the charge of luxury. That charge must relate to one or more of the following details, viz., the house the missionary lives in, the clothing he wears, the food he eats, the servants he employs, the conveyance he uses, the vacation he gets, or in general the married life which is permitted him. And, in the last analysis, the whole question, to a practical man, must turn upon the salary which is paid.

(1) We have always provided that the missionary should have a decent house to live in. This we consider essential to his health, comfort and efficiency. But such a house as he needs puts him far above the Asiatic and the Polynesian. Do the critics know what they are saying, when they ask that our missionaries should "live as the natives do"? That means in a dingy, smoky hut, with a cow, donkey, fowls and vermin for domestic companions. How can the preacher of a pure religion, which requires that he keep himself "undefiled," conform to the filthy usages of Oriental natives ? No, we send our representative to teach those poor people how to live as well as how to pray. We want to show them a Christian house as well as a Christian Bible. In fact, the Bible will soon create the house, if we do not. Such a house may be of any style you please, but it must have rooms adapted to the common necessities of eating, sleeping, bathing, studying, and perhaps teaching and preaching. It must have a thick roof to keep out the sun and rain ; and, in hot countries, a wide veranda and spacious grounds, if possible, for air and shade trees and a few flowers, and very likely, also, for schools, hospitals or orphanage, all under the eye of the missionary, and enclosed by a suitable wall. You may take down your walls as much as you like in America, but you dare not do it in Turkey or China.

(2) We certainly want our missionaries to wear proper clothing. But if they lived "like the natives" they would often wear nothing but a waist-cloth and turban. Should we want them to do that ? Are not personal cleanliness and self-respect a part of our religion, wherever we live ? In truth, the matter of clothing seems more expensive than it really is in the East. Our missionaries often dress in white flannel which is very becoming and very cheap, and easily washed for a trifle. The cork or pith helmet is considered a great protection from the sun, and they all wear it just as other foreigners do. It may seem a luxury in the eyes of a cooley, but it is nothing more nor less than a necessity for the men of our race in that climate.

(3) The missionary is expected to provide an abundance of good and nourishing food for himself and his family. But this costs money. He cannot live on rice alone, and that often is so dear that millions of Hindoos and Chinamen cannot afford it and have to be content with cheaper grains like millet and sorghum. Many articles of food, such as our people require, have to be obtained from Europe or America. In a cer-

tain sense they are luxuries, just as tea and coffee and sugar are luxuries to us. Yet most civilized people call them necessaries, and use them freely. Shall we grudge the missionary his American flour and butter, his Oregon salmon, and Chicago bacon if he craves them, as he certainly does when he is in a healthy working condition? His wife will probably have some delicacies, perhaps the gift of kind friends, reserved for some special occasion, like an annual meeting of the mission, or the visit of some stranger. How unkind, how unjust, in such a stranger to go away and report that the missionary lives luxuriously, has elegant table service, and rare dishes and many courses, when the fact is that the table at which he was a guest was furnished in quite an exceptional way, with those articles which had been carefully kept perhaps since the wedding-day in the dear home-land, and were brought out now as a mark of courtesy to the welcome visitor! Ordinarily the herald of the cross in those lands studies economy in his food as in everything else. He has to, and he wants to, as a matter of principle, wherever he might happen to live! But pray, let him not starve himself or his children. We never sent him out to do that. If we listened to the critics and required our brethren to avoid the appearance of luxury by adopting the native practice, let us see for a moment what such a menu would be: Bean-curd soup, rotten fish, boiled seaweed, fricassee de bow-wow, rissoles of donkey, and, in some missionary lands, lizards, snakes and maggots.

(4) As to servants. In order that the missionary and his wife may have as much of their time as possible to devote to the official work for which they were sent, we have always advised them not to burden themselves personally with the heavy work of housekeeping, but to employ native labor in the matter of cooking, washing, sweeping, stabling, etc., and when we know that servants can be had for ten, five and even three cents a day, and board themselves, we think we shall continue to give the same advice. Yet, it is said, many of our givers at home do their own work and could not afford to hire servants. Very likely. But that is not to the point. The question is not whether the missionary shall work hard, but what kind of work he shall do. Shall it be cooking food, or preaching the gospel? He cannot do both, which shall it be?

(5) As to equipage. Our missionaries generally have some kind of conveyance to ride in when they go on their preaching tours from village to village, and when they inspect schools or visit the sick. These conveyances vary according to the locality. There are bullock-bandies, pony tongas, ekkas, gharries, saddle-horses, house boats, sedan-chairs, mule-litters and jin-riki-sha, to say nothing of camels and elephants. These may all be used without much expense, and they save our workers a great deal of strength which they need in their work. Does any one say that the missionary ought to go afoot? Let him try it first, and he will never say it again.

(6) As to vacations. Our Board has even been so indulgent as to provide summer resorts for its missionaries. They are encouraged at all our stations to get relief for body and mind by going to the hills in the unhealthy season. But this is a luxury, and many good people at home do not have vacations. The cases are not parallel. The missionary, be it remembered, lives in close contact with another and much lower type of civilization, which wearies and exhausts him beyond our conception, and he often lives in regions afflicted with heat and its accompaniments of fever, cholera, leprosy, and many other terrible diseases, against which he must be constantly on his guard and especially during the sickly period when thousands perish all about him. Shall he not take care of himself, then, and go with his family to some place of refuge for a few weeks and be safe? Who dares to say, No?

(7) There is no space left to speak of the advantages of married life in a foreign mission. We often send unmarried missionaries, but history shows that in the long run the most successful missionaries have been married. Converted natives are very emphatic in telling us that the missionary family life is a perpetual argument for Christianity among them, an object lesson of untold value.

(8) But, finally, the charge of luxury is already silenced when we announce the slender stipend upon which the missionary has to live. He cannot be extravagant on so meagre an allowance. It is simply impossible, and that ends the question.

LEXINGTON, MASS.

ENDEAVOR—WHAT?

BY REV. JOHN HALL, D.D., LL.D., PASTOR OF THE FIFTH AVENUE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, NEW YORK.

From *The Golden Rule*, Boston, November 27, 1890.

"CHRISTIAN Endeavor? endeavor what?"
"Why, endeavor to do right."
"To do right in what?"

"Right—well, of course everybody knows what's right," and the puzzled member tried to change the conversation. He had the best intentions, but he had not definite ideas that could be presented off-hand.

The suggestion of a few such ideas may help some reader, and attention is asked to them, for it is a pity to be silent when a reason is demanded for Christian action. The hint that the devil suggests in such a case is that the one questioned is in the movement because somebody managed it, but that he or she really knows nothing about it. Contempt, not respect, is the issue.

Now, young friends, endeavor *to take care of your bodies.* God made them; in a sense they are His. Treat them as His; do nothing that will injure them. Their health in the future will be a great element in your happiness. Do nothing with food, or delicacies, or amusements, or drink, or too late hours, or games, or sins that cannot be named, that will injure your bodies or expose them to injury. A soldier on the battle-field has to go into peril; it is the duty of the hour. But you are not soldiers in this sense. Many a life is a failure because the members that ought to have been instruments of righteousness have been injured through thoughtlessness and sin.

Endeavor to take *care of your minds.* You have each a *memory.* Do not let any one, by spoken or printed words, put rubbish into it. You have an imagination. Do not let it be polluted by suggestions of evil. You have an *understanding.* Use it in its place; train it to raise and get answers to practical questions. "The fellows mostly do;" "the girls all say." Yes; is the thing they say or do right? Then get a standard of right. Did you ever see a practical carpenter when some question is raised about the length or breadth of something? He puts his hand in his pocket, brings out a rule, opens it and lays it along the board. "It is just eighteen inches and a half; there it is; see?" So he settles it. Friends of the *Christian* Endeavor, you know what *the* Rule is; train your understanding to use it. "Prove all things." You have *conscience.* When the understanding pronounces a thing right, conscience says, Do it. If you do, conscience gets confidence and speaks out the next time; if you do not, conscience falls into silence and waits until it can say—and often with a keen reproach—I told you so. Take care of your *affections.* Do not let them twine themselves about brambles. If you do, they will drag you down and you will be trampled upon some day. Set them on "things above." What those are you can learn from the Rule. Have you a pocket Bible?

Take *care of your home.* There is father; you little know the cares he has in order to get you what he thinks you need. And mother—how much she has done, is doing for you! You can gladden, cheer and honor them, or you can break their hearts. There's brother—your own brother—how much you can strengthen and help him, over a hard lesson, in a little difficulty, perhaps, when he is tempted to do wrong, by a gentle word, not of lecturing or scolding or threatening, but of loving entreaty, "Don't, Charlie, dear; it's not good, and it will vex mother." Many a pure, true sister has saved her brother. He laughs a little, perhaps, when she is advising or beseeching him—quizzes her, perhaps—but he says to himself afterward, "Well, I'd like—but Janey's a good girl, and it would trouble her. I guess I'll not." What would you think of any one who took lodgings with a family and brought in a patient with smallpox? Keep all contagion, all infection, all seeds of evil, out of your home. You know the hymn that so many will sing on Thanksgiving Day. Here is a poor parody of it, which perhaps you will remember:

My home, it is of thee,
Where all are good to me,
Of thee I sing:
Home of my father's cares,
Home of my mother's prayers,
O God, through all the years
Thy blessing bring!

Take *care of your influence.* Let it be for good only. Even an innocent thing to you may *look bad* to a younger or less instructed one than you. Then keep away from it. Do not copy him who began with, "Am I my brother's keeper?" and ended a murderer of his brother. Rather, try to be a blessing. You know how people put at the end of a notice "N. B."—*nota bene*—a little bit of Latin that we have adopted, meaning, *Mark well; don't forget.* Well, there is an N. B. in the Bible: "But to do good and to communicate"—now comes the N. B.—"forget not." Look at it in Heb. 13:16. Why should we thus endeavor? Mainly because we trust Jesus Christ, who died for us in love, and we love Him for it. In Him we are taken into the family of His Father, who gave Him for us in love, and we love Him. Through Christ, the Holy Spirit comes and lives in us, not in spite of ourselves, but at our earnest request, and we would not grieve Him; no, we would fain make our lives a reverent doxology "to the glory of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

For The Magazine of Christian Literature.

THE "CHURCH SUPPORT" SYMPOSIUM.

[Brief Reasons for Various Theories of Church Support.]

IV.

The Free Church System Supported by Pledges.

BY THE REV. GEORGE WOOLSEY HODGE, M.A., RECTOR OF THE CHURCH OF THE ASCENSION, PHILADELPHIA; FORMERLY SECRETARY, AND NOW MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE FREE AND OPEN CHURCH ASSOCIATION, ETC.

The position which is maintained in this article, of the propriety and expediency of providing for the support of churches by means of voluntary pledges, is based on the supposition of the necessity of the seats in churches being free. If it were not for this necessity, we should be quite willing to admit that the sale and rental of pews might be a most convenient and efficient mode of securing a revenue, just as fairs, raffles, and lotteries are easy means of raising money. But the question is not simply how to secure most readily and regularly the largest income, for if it were there would be no objection to using any of the above methods.

The first question for the Church is, how best to accomplish the one great purpose for which it exists, that of carrying the Gospel to all creatures, how to reach and hold and minister to the largest number of souls. The question of Church Support must be subsidiary to that. And any method of securing that support which in any degree interferes with that primary purpose of the church, or throws any bar or hindrance in the way of accomplishing its spiritual work, should not be tolerated for an instant, no matter how easy or efficacious it may be. And unless the Church's doors are thrown wide open and the fullest and the freest invitation is given to every one to enter them, unless men are made to feel that a church is a place where every one, no matter what may be his worldly circumstances or ability, has a right and welcome, and where it is his duty to be, we do not believe the Church can ever fulfil its mission of reaching all classes and conditions of men. We believe that the not adhering to this principle in the past has resulted in the alienation of the masses from the Church; in creating the impression that the Church is only for the well-to-do, who can afford it, or for the absolutely pauper class, who are content to be dependent upon the alms of the rich; in the cultivation of habits of non-church-going even among multitudes of professedly religious people, owing to the difficulty they experience and the uncomfortable feeling they have in going to any church in which they cannot afford, or it is not convenient for them, to rent a pew; and in making it morally impossible to attract and hold the vast number of persons who are careless and indifferent about religious things. On these grounds and others which we will not stop to enumerate, we hold that it is absolutely essential, if the Church is to have any higher ambition, or do any larger work, than that of simply ministering to a comparatively few well-to-do people, already piously inclined, who club together to maintain its ministrations, that its seats should be always and everywhere free.

This being assumed, we maintain that the wisest and best method of supporting churches under this system is that of asking from the regular attendants, or those interested in them, pledges or subscriptions to be paid yearly, quarterly, monthly, or weekly, as may be most convenient or agreeable, and at the same time giving constant opportunities for the reception of unpledged offerings.

There is not the slightest inconsistency in this with the free system, because it in nowise interferes with the freedom of the seats, no one is obliged to make such a pledge if he does not wish, or is unable, to do so, nor is his going to the church or enjoyment of its ministrations at all dependent upon the amount of his pledge, or upon whether he gives anything at all.

The advantages of this system are that while it secures the freedom of the seats (1), it provides a stated and regular revenue upon which the church officers can depend, and upon which they can base their expenditures. (2) It does not make the income dependent upon the attendance at a particular service or season of the year, the pledges running over the whole year. (3) It teaches people to fix upon a definite sum which they ought to give. (4) It secures the amount thus determined on being paid at one time if not at another. (5) It does not make the position one occupies in church, or his reception of its benefits, proportioned to his financial ability, but makes the amount he gives dependent solely upon the size of his income and his willingness to devote it to religious purposes, so that the one who can give only a little is precisely in the same position in the church as the person who can give largely. (6) It enables the offerings to be made secretly, that which the poor and the rich give looking exactly alike if enclosed in envelopes. (7) It saves the self-respect of the poor and those in moderate circumstances by making them feel that they are not receiving their religious privileges for nothing, but share in the support of the church, even though the amount they contribute be small. (8) It gives every one attending the church, not only the rich, or the heads of families, but each one, a sense of responsibility of bearing a share in its support. (9) It cultivates the habit of systematic giving, and teaches the supreme duty of setting aside a fixed definite proportion of one's income for religious purposes. (10) It makes giving dependent not upon impulse or emotion, or upon receiving a *quid pro quo* for the amount given, but upon intelligent, conscientious, and business principles. (11) It puts what one gives to the church in the light of an offering and act of worship, the token and pledge of the reality of his convictions and earnestness of his religious life, and not simply as the payment of an obligation for a convenience received. (12) It makes it easier to give in small sums than it would be to give a large sum at one time.

There is, therefore, a vast difference both in principle and in its effects, between renting the seats in churches and asking the pledge of a fixed sum for their support. And for the reasons we have given it seems to us that the pledge system is much superior to all others. It combines all the advantages of the free church with those of the pew system, without the enormous disadvantages attendant upon the latter. And it is better than depending merely upon unpledged offerings, as it secures a regular income, and system and conscientiousness in giving.

In practical experience it has so commended itself to the genius of our American people that it has already become the most prevalent mode of church support. And we believe that as Christian people come more and more to realize the great mission and purpose of the church, and willing to subordinate their own ease and comfort to its accomplishment, it is destined to become universal.

THE MONTH'S MIND.

New York awoke the other day to the luxury of a new sensation. A man of whom few had heard, outside of a narrow business circle, was found to have bequeathed something like $3,000,000, most of it to charitable and educational institutions. Various hospitals in the city received sums aggregating $95,000, and bequests were made to twenty-one different colleges and universities in all parts of the country, amounting to more than $2,000,000. The peculiarity of the case consisted less in the largeness of the sum given away—although there have been but two or three instances of larger gifts in this country—than in the fact that the donor had no public repute either as a rich man or as a liberal man. Among the few who knew him well he was known to be a man of means, but even they did not suspect the extent of his fortune. He was also known by his more intimate friends to be a generous, though always an unostentatious giver. Posthumous benevolence is less entitled to respect and gratitude than any other kind. The man who makes a virtue of necessity, and gives away his money when he can neither use it himself nor take it with him, is certainly less worthy of respect and grateful remembrance than the man who gives away a fortune during his own lifetime. The greater part of posthumous benevolence also loses title to any special respect by reason of its ostentation and selfishness. Men leave large sums to found institutions merely that their own names and memories may be perpetuated. The striking quality of Mr. Fayerweather's benevolence was this lack of ostentation. Instead of founding a new college to bear his name, or even chairs and scholarships to bear his name in connection with established colleges, he has made unconditional bequests of from $50,000 to $100,000 each to institutions already founded and in more or less flourishing condition. This method of disposing of his fortune has not only the merit of novelty, but in the end it will doubtless accomplish more good than if it had all been bestowed in the usual manner. Indeed, the good sense of Mr. Fayerweather cannot be too much commended, and his example, it is to be hoped, will be imitated by many other rich men who are contemplating large bequests. We have already a surplus of colleges and so called universities. We need fewer rather than more. But though the world would willingly let many of them die, each existing institution has its warm friends, who will do everything in their power to prevent a consummation so devoutly to be wished. The only practical policy is, therefore, to strengthen the institutions that we now have, and by all practicable means to create a public opinion opposed to the founding of other institutions. If all the bequests that have been devoted during the past generation to the founding of new and struggling colleges as monuments to rich men had been devoted to the fitting endowment of existing institutions, the cause of education in this country would have been greatly advanced. In saying this we do not, of course, refer to the one or two exceptional cases like the Johns Hopkins University, where some man has left a sufficient sum to found, equip and thoroughly endow a college that fills a place hitherto occupied by none. The cases to which we refer have been more common in the South and West, perhaps, than in the East, where the cost of founding a college is better appreciated. But in some sections of our country the idea prevails that $50,000 or $100,000 is a very liberal sum with which to set a college going. The latest of the new institutions (which is, strictly speaking, not so much a new one as a continuation of a work begun thirty years ago and suffered by bad management to fail), the University of Chicago, will begin its career with property and endowments worth fully $2,500,000, and it is not at all improbable that a few years will see this amount doubled.

* * *

For a few days it seemed probable that New York would enjoy a second new sensation, nothing less than the probate of this remarkable will, and the settlement of the estate without a legal contest. It seemed too good to be true when we read in the papers that all the heirs were satisfied, and had joined in the petition that the will be admitted to probate. It was too good to be true, or, perhaps one should say, to remain true. The widow of Mr. Fayerweather has decided to contest the will, on the ground, it is reported, of undue influence. The evidence of this undue influence is supposed to be found in codicils to the original will that make the executors residuary legatees. The fortune of the testator has so increased since the will was drawn, that from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000 are likely to remain after all the specific bequests have been paid. It is represented that Mrs. Fayerweather and the other heirs do not object to the bequests to hospitals and colleges, but question the equity of the codicils. There appears to be force in this objection, but an explanation has been offered that puts the matter in a new light. The original will made the colleges the residuary legatees, leaving the division of the residuary estate to the discretion of the executors; but the contest over the late Samuel J. Tilden's will made Mr. Fayerweather fear that the courts might pronounce so indefinite a bequest invalid. Accordingly, he is said to have adopted the expedient of bequeathing the residuary estate absolutely to his executors, leaving them an expression of his wishes that he could trust them to carry out. The result, it is said, if the will is sustained will be that a college to which $100,000 is definitely bequeathed will also receive from the residuary estate an additional $150,000. In other words, the bequest is in fact, though not in form, a bequest in trust. A formal bequest in trust would have been of doubtful legality, but in this way Mr. Fayerweather hoped to carry out his plans in a manner unquestionably legal. If this be a true statement of his plan and the intent of his executors, it will be seen that Mrs. Fayerweather, whatever she may intend or protest, in contesting the will is really striving to bring to naught one of the largest schemes of beneficence ever conceived by an American. It would be deplorable if the technicalities of law should stand in the way of realizing so grand a plan. Many of the attempts to "break" wills, so common of late years, have been marked by cynical immorality, but the breaking of this will would be more than a private wrong, it would take on the proportions of a public calamity.

* * *

This case adds another to the numerous object lessons of man's duty to be his own executor. Mr. Andrew Carnegie is credited with the saying that it is a disgrace to a man to die rich, but it is a disgrace that most men would willingly incur. It is a disgrace, however, or if not a disgrace, an exhibition of folly, for a man who has money to give for benevolent objects and the disposition to give it, to leave the matter to such uncertainties as the disposition of greedy heirs and the subtleties of legal interpretation. When Mr. Fayerweather found, from the case of Mr. Tilden, that his will was of uncertain validity, why did not so shrewd a man of business resolve to settle all legal quibbles out of hand by becoming his own executor? By neglecting to take this course he missed some of the happiest experiences a rich man can have, the actual vision of the good being accomplished by the millions he has toiled with so much self-denial and persistence to accumulate. He not only missed this joy, which would have brought real light and gladness into the closing years of his life, but the institutions he might have aided have lost the counsel of a man so well fitted to aid them in wisely bestowing his bounty. Worse than all, he risked the complete wreck of his plan, the frustration of all his hopes. Even if the will finally stands, the public will be sickened with a deluge of scandal about a man of whose failings it would choose to know nothing in its high appreciation of his virtues. Does not the whole case strongly emphasize the words of him who wrote this golden sentiment: "I shall pass through this world but once. Any good thing, therefore, that I can do, or any kindness that I can show to any human being, let me do it now. Let me not defer it or neglect it, for I shall not pass this way again."

* * *

It is too soon to say whether "the mission" begun in this city by Father Ignatius will create as great a ferment in New York as it did in Boston. In Boston the Father began with the great advantage of apparent martyrdom. It was martyrdom on a very small scale, to be sure, but enough to answer the purpose of an excellent advertisement. The fact is that Father Ignatius is a monk of the order of St. Benedict, he having revived an ancient monastic order of the Church of England. He proclaims himself an English Catholic, and repudiates Protestantism. He received orders as a deacon a number of years ago, but has never been ordained to the priesthood in the Anglican Church. His monastery is an independent organization that has no standing or recognition in the Church of England. Coming to this country, he is required by the canon law to obtain a license to preach from the bishop of a diocese before he can preach in any of its churches. Bishop Paddock, of Massachusetts, thought the above facts were a sufficient reason why a license to preach in his diocese should be refused, and therefore Father Ignatius was obliged to preach in halls and in various Protestant churches that were offered to him for the purpose. Bishop Potter, of New York, though not specially enamored of the man or his methods, has given him a license to preach, and he has preached in some of the metropolitan churches, though he seems to prefer holding forth in the public halls. The general character of his preaching is not unfairly described if we compare it to that of the old-fashioned Methodist revivalist. It is sensational in the extreme. It is also picturesque, exciting, and comparatively novel—so old, that is to say, that it is new. Father Ignatius himself is tonsured like any Roman monk, and he wears the serge gown, hempen girdle, and sandals of the Roman monk. His preaching consists largely of denunciations of worldly Christianity. Its staple is an appeal to the feelings; he decries reason and exalts the emotional element of Christianity; he advises and commends an ascetic type of piety. For the time being preaching like this will, of course, create a considerable furor. The extent and wholesomeness of its influence will remain to be estimated hereafter.

* * *

The Protestant Episcopal Church, considering its wealth and culture, has never had an adequate representation among the educational institutions of our country. With the exception of Columbia, none of the colleges under the control of Episcopalians have been equal in size, endowment, and scholarship to those established by other religious bodies. This somewhat remarkable fact is probably to be explained by the neglect of the Church hitherto in providing for systematic beneficence for educational purposes or official supervision of the work. The gifts made have been made by individuals from their own sense of duty to God and man, and many of the gifts of Episcopalians have not gone to institutions controlled by their own Church. The need of ecclesiastical supervision has been felt in this Church for some time past, and within a few weeks a body has been organized, known as the Church University Board of Regents, which practically corresponds to the education societies that have been established and maintained by the Methodists, Presbyterians and Baptists. The founding of schools and colleges will no longer go on at haphazard, and opportunities of planting schools in strategic points will not be missed hereafter for the lack of means and foresight. This Board of Regents will have as one of its functions to decide where new schools should be established, and how far existing institutions are deserving of aid. The approval of the Board will be a necessary preliminary to the raising of funds, and it is altogether probable that the Regents will undertake in the course of time the raising of a large common endowment fund. The aim is, if we are correctly informed, in the end to consolidate all existing Episcopalian institutions into one university under the control of this Board of Regents. This is a large scheme, but if successfully carried out, the results could not well fail to be most gratifying.

⁂

One of the marvels in the history of the Christian church is the rapid growth of the organization known as the King's Daughters. Beginning in this city a few years ago with a membership of ten consecrated women, it has enlarged its bounds until its members are found in every State of the Union. At a recent session of the order in this city a membership of over 160,000 was represented. No organization for Christian service has been superior to this in arousing enthusiasm and promoting personal piety. Its rapid growth can only be accounted for upon the hypothesis that an organization of this kind was especially suited to the wants of the day. Its strong points have been two: First, it did not attempt any specific Christian work, but sought rather the development of a spirit of consecration, leaving the form in which this should express itself to the individual conscience and the providence of God; and, secondly, it has been from the first entirely unsectarian, requiring no pledge of membership beyond simple loyalty to the King. Any one who was willing to accept Jesus as Lord was eligible to membership in the order. The breadth of this principle has led to some complications that are much to be regretted, though it has no doubt been one of the chief causes of the order's rapid growth. Of course, it is inevitable that any organization that increases in numbers so rapidly as this should to some extent deteriorate, for it is impossible that many should not be drawn into the movement who have no deep sympathy with its spirit and objects. Nevertheless, the King's Daughters have been a great power for good, and no one who knows what they have done or has any conception of the possibilities of their work in the future can speak any word save a God-speed.

⁂

Church union is certainly the topic of the day. It is a question whether this is due to the sentimental attraction of the theme—and, in the case of many Christians, religion chiefly appeals to the emotions—or whether Americans are like the Athenians in Paul's day, and do nothing but hear or tell of some new thing. What is not in question is the interest at present taken in the subject. Within the last month a number of religious bodies have discussed the subject at length and from various points of view. At a public meeting of Presbyterians in the Metropolitan Opera House, Mr. William E. Dodge, one of the best known and most influential laymen in that communion, spoke of the necessity of united Christian effort in behalf of the 600,000 to 700,000 people in New York who are practically unreached by the churches, and whose increasing numbers constitute a serious danger to society. He estimated that fully two fifths of the population are given over to infidelity and indifference to religion. The substantial accuracy of Mr. Dodge's statements will probably not be doubted by any. The question of remedy is, however, more difficult. The remedy that finds most favor among Presbyterians at present is a federation of the churches, by which the forces of the various religious bodies may be arrayed against the powers of evil and the effective working force may be wielded by one controlling agency. There is something about the largeness of this plan that will be captivating to many minds, but it would be wasting argument to prove that it is wholly incompatible with existing conditions. Anything properly deserving the name of federation is impossible unless the various denominations of Christians no longer sincerely believe their distinctive tenets and are willing to surrender their nominal faiths on demand. No one who has any considerable acquaintance with religious affairs believes this. It does not follow because polemics, whether in the pulpit or in the press, are somewhat less fashionable now than they were in a former generation, that beliefs are less tenaciously held. The various Christian bodies are learning more and more that it is possible to speak the truth in love to and about one another, and this is promoting a mildness and courtesy of speech that did not formerly prevail. But this by no means indicates that the dividing lines between sects are less sharply drawn, or would be less obstinately maintained on occasion than in former years. We have learned, and the world is to be congratulated that it is so, to put more stress on the things in which we agree than on the things about which we differ. But the differences are still there, and they are as great, as insurmountable as they ever were. The only sort of federation possible would be such a combination for certain limited charitable and philanthropic purposes as evangelical Christians have already made in various Bible societies, Christian associations, the Evangelical Alliance, and other familiar forms of Christian activity. Indeed, the word federation suggests so many ideas utterly repugnant to most Christian people, that its use in this connection cannot be regarded as anything but unfortunate in the extreme.

⁂

Former generations treated criminals with an undue and sometimes barbarous severity. The Draconian Code, which punished every manner of offence with death, was not much more severe than the law that prevailed in England until the present century, condemning to death every person who stole property to the value of more than five shillings. A great change has been wrought in the laws of Christendom during the last fifty years, until we seem much inclined to go to the opposite extreme, and to regard crime and criminals with a mawkish sentimentalism. This tendency was well illustrated in the treatment that has lately been given to a criminal in one of our great cities. A member of a prominent church, active in Sunday-school work, he had for years been engaged in systematic forgeries, amounting in the aggregate to $300,000. When his crime was detected, and he had brought ruin upon the partners who trusted him and disgrace upon his family and friends, and not till then, he professed sorrow and penitence for his misdeeds. Pleas for a light sentence were made in his behalf on the ground of his prominence in society, his hitherto unblemished reputation, his activity in Christian work, and the like. But it is gratifying to note that the judge was not imposed upon by this nonsense. On the contrary, he held that these facts added to the heinousness of the offence, and he therefore sentenced him to the full extent of the penalty prescribed by law. But the judge seems to have been the only one who has had any connection with the affair that has preserved his moral equilibrium. The convicted and disgraced forger sent a letter to the church of which he was a member professing "bitter sorrow and sincere repentance;" whereupon the church voted to "retain his name upon the rolls in the faith that no man more needs the watch and care of a Christian church than one who has fallen into sin but has sincerely repented of his sin and desired to return to the way of righteousness and life."

* * *

The event of the month in the Church of England has been the decision of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the case of the prosecution of the Bishop of Lincoln for alleged ritualistic and uncanonical practices. This prosecution, which was begun more than a year ago, has caused great feeling among English Churchmen, and at one time threatened to result in open schism, or at least in an unseemly conflict. It is probable that the decision rendered by Archbishop Benson will allay the excitement and, for the present at least, prevent further divisions. The decision is remarkable for its moderation and impartiality. It will not entirely satisfy either party to the suit. It condemns some of the acts of Bishop King, as, for instance, his practice of standing with his back to the people during the prayer of consecration, so that the communicants could not see him break the bread and take the cup according to the direction of the rubric. Another point decided against the Bishop of Lincoln was with regard to the use of the mixed chalice. It was shown that while the mixing of water and wine in the communion cup was a custom of long standing in the church and therefore not illegal, the mixing of water and wine as part of the service is contrary to the law of England. The curious nature of some of the decisions contained in the archbishop's judgment is due to the fact that he was constrained to abide by the letter of the law, and the law regulating the usages of the Established Church in England is a series of compromises, without consistency, in this part lending support to one doctrine and practice, and in another part as distinctly approving an opposed doctrine or practice. On account of these inconsistencies a man holding almost any variety of theology and advocating almost any form of worship can find something somewhere in the law that will sustain him, at least in part. It is this sense of uncertainty and conflict in the law that has given so great an impulse during the last few years in the Church itself toward disestablishment.

* * *

The Conference for Bible Study recently held in Brooklyn was hardly described, as to its real objects, by its chosen title. It should have been called "a conference of those who believe in the premillennial coming of Christ." It is true that the invitation to the Christian public was general, but it is also true that those who took a prominent part in the proceedings were believers in the premillennial doctrine. They did not lack the courage of their convictions or the gift of utterance. One of the most distinguished speakers declared that the great majority of biblical scholars support the premillennial theory; that the majority is so great it may be said to amount to a consensus, at least nine tenths of the scholars of the present day holding this view. Another speaker (in what, for charity's sake, one hopes was a state of abnormal excitement) denounced those who believe in "the infernal doctrine of the conversion of the world before the coming of Christ." Father Ignatius, it may be fair to remark here, also holds that Christianity was not intended to convert the world, but cherishes the blessed hope that the world is to grow worse and worse until the appearing of our Lord. It is somewhat remarkable that men with reputations to lose should be willing to make in public statements like these, and that there are such men is one of the significant facts in current religious history.

* * *

Few propositions could be made that would more quickly touch a responsive chord in the hearts of New York Christians than the suggestion to erect a monument to the memory of the late Charles Loring Brace. It is true there have not been wanting some grumbling disciples to say, "Why all this waste?" but there will be few to think the cost of such a memorial ill spent. Mr. Brace has already one monument in New York that would be an honor to any man in the Children's Aid Society. This beneficent and many-sided work was placed by him on enduring foundations. During the past year it has maintained five lodging-houses for boys and one for girls, in which lodging and meals are provided at a merely nominal price. Besides, it has carried on twenty-one industrial schools and twelve night schools, in which not only elementary education but manual training is given. But, after all, the greatest good accomplished by this society has consisted in the establishment of the waifs and strays of our city in country homes, where they have been removed from the temptations of city life and have been given an opportunity to become useful men and women. During the history of the society more than 75,000 have been so cared for. Of course, there have been some failures, but they have been relatively few, and a large proportion of the boys and girls who have thus been saved from poverty and crime in this city are now well-to-do and respected members of society. It is worth noting that this is the precise way in which General Booth expects to accomplish most for the building up of character "in darkest England." He proposes to establish colonies in rural districts of England and in various parts of the world, to which men and women who have "fallen overboard" shall be sent and given a new opportunity to redeem themselves. The Children's Aid Society has the double advantage of beginning this work at the beginning, taking the tramp and criminal before he has become such, while childhood still offers a plastic character to work upon. It proceeds upon the theory that formation is better than reformation, less costly to society, and more certain in its results. That the man who founded this work and so many years successfully carried it on deserves a permanent memorial from the people whom he served so long and faithfully it needs no argument to prove.

⁂

A LIBERAL CHRISTIAN ALLIANCE has been organized in Chicago by a convention representing so-called liberal Christians in all parts of the country. This new alliance avows as its object the promotion of a better and more spiritual interpretation of Christianity and of fellowship in spirit and work among liberal Christians. It is distinctly provided in the constitution that the alliance shall in no way disturb either the independence or the denominational relations of members. Professor David Swing, who is the president of the new organization, is said to have explained to a reporter that the body is "primarily a social club composed of persons having certain aims in common." The word Christian, he added, is used "in its broadest sense as a philosophical, not as a theological term, to include all who believe in Christ as the source from which emanate all good works." Liberal Christians, so called, are, as a rule, not gregarious. The principle of individualism is too strong for continued united action, and it is not likely that this new alliance will be a long lived or influential body.

⁂

AN interesting question is now being decided in the Methodist Episcopal Church, it being a proposed modification of the constitution of the body, so as to admit women as lay delegates to the General Conference. The women seem likely to win in this contest, for a contest it has become, waged with much vigor and some bitterness on both sides. At present the total vote stands: affirmative, 8497; against, 9507—a majority of over a thousand against the change. The decision, however, is not by plebiscitum, but by the vote of the churches, the majority in each church deciding the vote of that body. It is possible, therefore, as in a Presidential election, for a minority on the total vote to get a majority of the churches, and there are indications that this may be the result. What is a much graver thing than this possible change in the constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church is the means by which it has been urged. There has never been a case, in the history of any modern religious body, that professed respect for the Scriptures, of more flagrant disregard of scriptural teaching. Those who opposed the change laid great stress on the declarations of Paul concerning the place of woman in the church—an honorable place, a place suitable to her special endowments, but not a place of teaching or exercising authority. The advocates of woman's admission to the General Conference have attempted no answer to this apparently decisive objection. In great part they have contemptuously ignored it, making much of woman's alleged "equality" with man, uttering impassioned appeals for emancipation and justice. When they have condescended to notice the scriptural objections to their proposed amendment, they have met it in a way that implies total disbelief in the divine inspiration and permanent authority of Paul's writings—at least of the part of those writings that discusses woman's position in the church. They did not attempt any exegesis of the New Testament that would bring it into harmony with their position—that they probably felt to be a hopeless task, as Paul's meaning is quite too clear to be explained away. No; they adopted the simpler course of blotting out of their Bibles, so far as their own belief or obedience is concerned, all that did not suit their ideas of what the Scriptures should say. We need hardly point out that this is the most dangerous kind of infidelity, the kind that professes belief yet cherishes a secret notion (which on occasion is expressed) that, as Mr. Lowell has it, "They didn't know everything down in Judee." It is the sort of infidelity that led a noted preacher to declare he would disbelieve the divinity of Christ, if he were convinced that our Lord made intoxicating wine at Cana of Galilee. It is the infidelity that really believes in nothing but itself, that doubts even God if He presumes to be or do other than what these wise people have decided that He must be and do. It does not come with its ideas to the Scriptures to find if its conception of the truth be correct: it brings the Scriptures into judgment by the light of its ideas, and rejects what will not endure this test. This infidelity many call faith. It may be faith, but it is not faith in God or in His Word.

PARAGRAPHIC.

ACCORDING to a correspondent in *Notes and Queries*, there is "rank confusion" in episcopal signatures. Thus Mr. Edward Walford points out that even during the present century one bishop of St. Asaph wrote "W. Asaphens," his successor "W. St. Asaph;" one bishop of Chester wrote "W. Chester," and another "W. Cestr.;" one bishop of Oxford wrote "R. Oxford," and the next signed his name "S. Oxon.;" Bishop Phillpotts wrote "H. Exeter," but his successor, Dr. Temple, "F. Exon." and he now writes "F. Londin," his predecessors having always written "C. L. London," "W. London," etc. A hundred years ago Dr. Thurlow, Bishop of Durham, signed "T. Duresme," but his successors have always written "W. Dunelm."—*Southern Churchman.*

A WOMAN in Philadelphia, left a widow, was obliged to support her family, and she now makes quite a snug little sum in this way: She is a perambulating housekeeper, and has a dozen or more clients on her list, as many in fact as she can comfortably serve. She goes from house to house, making weekly visits, and serving two and sometimes more of her customers in one day. Her duties are inspectorial and directorial. She goes over a house from cellar to garret, looks after the linen, furniture, decorations, and has authority to give directions to the servants or resident housekeeper. She prepares a daily *menu* a week ahead, audits the accounts of tradesmen and very often has the entire supervision over dinner parties and receptions. No detail in the management of a household escapes her.—*Southern Churchman.*

COLONEL INGERSOLL, some years ago, assumed the prophet's rôle, and foretold the decay of Christianity. The following characteristic communication from Chaplain McCabe was lately sent to him: "Time is up, Robert. Chaplain McCabe's message to Colonel Ingersoll: Dear Colonel: Ten years ago you made the following prediction: 'Ten years from this time two theatres will be built for one church.' The time is up. The Methodists are now building four churches every day—one every six hours. Please venture upon another prediction for the year 1900."—*Christian Herald.*

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

The Father of Church History in a New English Dress.*

By Philip Schaff.

It is not too much to say that the first volume of the Second Series of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Library* is the most important original contribution which America has made to patristic learning. If we except a few monographs on the recently discovered "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," American literature is barren in this important department of Church history. The Church of England has well-nigh monopolized the study of the Fathers among Protestant denominations, and has recently produced a monumental work on patristics, the like of which even the Greek and Roman Church, or German scholarship, cannot boast of. We mean, of course, the "Dictionary of Christian Biography" of the first eight centuries, edited by Dr. Wace, Principal of King's College, London, who has recently been selected by the senior editor as co-editor of the Second Series of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Library*. Among the many contributors to the four stately volumes of this Dictionary there is only one American contributor, and he not an Episcopalian. The edition of the "Apostolic Fathers," by the late Bishop Lightfoot, of Durham, must also be mentioned as a work of the highest and broadest scholarship, which is superior to all other editions. "The Oxford Library of the Fathers" is exclusively the work of English Episcopalians, and "The Ante-Nicene Library" of Roberts and Donaldson (republished by Bishop Coxe, with valuable additions) is the joint product of English and Scotch scholars.

But if the book we are now reviewing may be taken as a fair sign of the times, we have good reason to expect at no very distant future a rich harvest from the rising generation of American Church historians.

It is right and proper that in this American revival of the study of Church history we should begin at the foundations. The famous work of Eusebius covers the first three centuries to the time of the great change marked by the appearance of the great Constantine. No matter what view we take of the ability and trustworthiness of the author, his work will always be consulted as the chief authority on the history of the ante-Nicene age, because he is the father of Church history, as Herodotus is the father of secular history, and because he has made industrious use of all the sources then accessible, some of which have been lost in whole or in part. His history, therefore, has itself to a large extent the character and value of a primary source.

Eusebius has been several times translated and edited in English. The last translation prior to that of Dr. McGiffert was made by an American Episcopalian, Dr. Crusé, of New York. It is reprinted in Bohn's Library and in the Bagster edition of the Greek historians, which includes also Socrates, Sozomenus, Theodoret and Evagrius. But it is no more than a translation with a brief biographical introduction and a few scattered notes. And the translation itself is rather loose and often inaccurate.

Dr. McGiffert leaves all the previous editions of Eusebius at a respectful distance. He furnishes not only a new translation more faithful and idiomatic than the former ones, but a complete introduction of seventy-two double column pages on the life and works of Eusebius, and in foot-notes a running commentary, which occupies nearly as much space and more matter in small type than the text itself. His Eusebius is in fact, though not in form, a critical history of the first three centuries with the light that modern research and learning, Catholic and Protestant, German and English, has spread over it. In these notes Dr. McGiffert gives evidence that he has mastered the numerous recent investigations concerning the post-apostolic literature, the Apologists, the ancient heresies, the martyrology, the canon, and other important phenomena of the second and third centuries. It is well known to scholars that not a few documents of great importance relating to that period have been discovered within the last thirty years, such as the Codex Sinaiticus of the Greek Bible, the Greek Barnabas, the Greek Pastor of Hermas, the Syriac Ignatius, the Tenth Book of the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, the Philosophumena of Hippolytus, fragments of Aristides and Miltiades, a new and complete manuscript of the First and Second Epistle of Clement of Rome, Tatian's Diatessaron, and last, though not least, the Didache of the Twelve Apostles. They have given rise to a large literature so that even the three great master works of ancient Church history by Neander, Gieseler and Baur are left behind, and are almost superseded, as far as the second century is concerned, because they were ignorant of these new discoveries. Dr. McGiffert had the advantage over them and has made conscientious use of his facilities. He has devoted four or five years to the task. His work is up to the latest date of German, English and American scholarship, and indispensable to the student of ante-Nicene Church history.

The work is too recent to have been publicly noticed in foreign periodicals; but I have received favorable judgments of competent German critics, as Professor Harnack, of Berlin, and Professor Holtzmann, of Strassburg. German scholars rarely get to see American books, unless they are sent to them by the authors or friends, and if they do, they are seldom able to read them with ease and comfort. While all German works of any importance are exported to America, and promptly bought by our scholars and institutions, the exportation of American theological works to Germany has not even begun, because there is no such demand for them as would justify the trouble and expense. But Drs. Harnack and Holtzmann read English with ease, and it may not be out of place to quote, in conclusion, an extract from a private letter of Dr. Holtzmann, which confirms all I said in favor of this noble monument of American patristic scholarship:

"On my return from vacation I find on my desk McGiffert's Eusebius translation. I could at once test and make use of it in many ways, and convince myself that it is an excellent means for easy orientation. The notes are very helpful and really constitute an admirable commentary. Here and there a German theologian will find something to supplement, especially as regards the latest literature. But even in this respect much more has been accomplished than I expected. I know no work ever published in Germany that is at once so rich and handy (*so reichhaltig und handhablich*) and furnishes such agreeable and fruitful instruction as this edition of Eusebius."

---

* A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Second Series. Translated into English with Prolegomena and Explanatory Notes under the Editorial Supervision of Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History in Union Theological Seminary, and Henry Wace, D.D., Principal of King's College, London. In connection with a number of Patristic scholars of Europe and America.

Vol. I. The Church History of Eusebius. Translated with Prolegomena and Notes by the Rev. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, Ph.D., Professor of Church History in Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati; The Life of Constantine, by Eusebius, together with the Oration of Constantine to the Assembly of the Saints, and the Oration of Eusebius in Praise of Constantine. A Revised Translation, with Prolegomena and Notes by Ernest Cushing Richardson, Ph.D., Librarian and Associate Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary (now Librarian, College of New Jersey). New York: Christian Literature Company (35 Bond Street), 1890. 632 pp., $3.00.

We have no space to notice the second part of this volume which contains Eusebius's Life of Constantine, his oration in praise of Constantine, and Constantine's Oration to the Assembly of the Saints, and which were prepared by Dr. Ernest Cushing Richardson (now librarian of Princeton College), except to say that the editor has done his work with conscientious care and furnished a more complete and accurate introduction and bibliography than can be found in any previous edition.

Altogether this stately volume of 632 royal octavo pages is the best beginning of the Second Series of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Library*, and guarantees its ultimate success if the twelve or thirteen volumes which are to follow shall give evidence of equal ability and scholarship.

Union Theological Seminary.

WORD STUDIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D., Baldwin Professor of Sacred Literature in Union Theological Seminary, New York. Vol. I., The Synoptic Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, Epistles of Peter, James and Jude. Vol. II., The Writings of John: the Gospel, the Epistles, the Apocalypse. Vol. III., The Epistles of Paul: Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887–90. 3 vols., 8vo, pp. xxiv., 822; vii., 607; xli., 565, $12.

Those who believe in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures must hold that the more exactly we get at the meaning of those Scriptures, the more clearly we understand the mind of God. Necessarily, then, the study of the letter is the foundation of spiritual knowledge. The assertion of this necessity is not impugned by the fact that spiritual knowledge should be emphasized as our aim, but is the rather strengthened thereby. Carelessness regarding the letter is really carelessness regarding the spirit.

To this examination of the letter of the Scriptures must come an impartial, judicial mind and a broad erudition. The imagination must be subject to the control of facts. Enthusiasm and prejudice have no place as guides. A logical treatment that uses a fair induction is demanded in the interest of truth. A thorough knowledge of the original language in which the Scriptures are written is an absolute necessity for their prime examiner. Others may take the result of his work, and, giving it all the confidence it deserves, build upon it, although they be ignorant of the original language. The linguistic examiner must not only know the original language, but he must know it so broadly as to compare its dialects and varieties of expression, its differing usages of the same forms, its idiomatic changes and its many styles. Hence he must know the literature of the language, and feel at home in handling it.

These qualities for a trustworthy guide in the examination of the Scriptures are not combined in very many. Where we find them we should prize them and the results of their labors. Dr. Marvin R. Vincent, of the Union Theological Seminary in New York, has published three volumes of "Word Studies in the New Testament," in which have been used the qualities which we have described above. The last of the three volumes, containing the Epistles of Paul, has been issued this year (1890) by the publishing house of Charles Scribner's Sons.

His plan has been, as the name of the book implies, to take up every word that could be eclaircized, and from etymology or usage or allusion to give the word and its context their full power before the reader's mind. In this his erudition has used the becoming patience of research, exactness of statement, and carefulness of reasoning which mark the complete scholar. The notes naturally vary in length. Of the longer notes we give a fair specimen, in which is most lucidly and admirably explained the meaning of the important word *νοῦς*, which is translated in our received version seven times as "understanding" and seventeen times as "mind."

"THE LAW OF MY MIND, Rom. vii. 23 (*τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου*). Νοῦς, *mind*, is a term distinctively characteristic of Paul, though not confined to him. (See Luke xxiv. 45; Apoc. xiii. 18; xvii. 9.) Paul's usage of this term is not based, like that of *spirit* and *flesh*, on the Septuagint, though the word occurs six times as the rendering of *lebh*, *heart*, and once of *ruach*, *spirit*. He uses it to throw into sharper relief the function of *reflective intelligence* and *moral judgment*, which is expressed generally by *καρδία*, *heart*. The key to its Pauline usage is furnished by the contrast in 1 Cor. xiv. 14–19, between speaking with *a tongue* and with *the understanding* (*τῷ νοΐ*), and between *the spirit* and *the understanding* (ver. 14). There it is the faculty of reflective intelligence which receives and is wrought upon by the Spirit. It is associated with *γνωμή*, *opinion*, resulting from its exercise, in 1 Cor. i. 10; and with *κρίνει*, *judgeth*, in Rom. xiv. 5. Paul uses it mainly with an ethical reference—*moral* judgment as related to action. See Rom. xii. 2, where the renewing of the *νοῦς*, *mind*, is urged as a necessary preliminary to a right moral judgment ('that ye may *prove*,' etc.). The *νοῦς* which does not exercise this judgment is *ἀδόκιμος*, *not approved*, *reprobate*. See note on *reprobate*, i. 28, and compare on 2 Tim. iii. 8; Tit. i. 15, where the *νοῦς* is associated with *the conscience*. See also on Eph. iv. 23. It stands related to *πνεῦμα*, *spirit*, as the faculty to the efficient power. It is 'the faculty of moral judgment which perceives and approves what is good, but has not the power of practically controlling the life in conformity with its theoretical requirements.' In the portrayal of the struggle in this chapter there is no reference to the *πνεῦμα*, *spirit*, which, on the other hand, distinctively characterizes the Christian state in ch. viii. In this chapter Paul employs only terms pertaining to the natural faculties of the human mind, and of these *νοῦς* is in the foreground." This note, in conjunction with the note on *πνεῦμα* in Rom. viii. 4, gives as clear and satisfactory an analysis of Paul's psychology as we have ever seen. This keen analytical power is found everywhere in these admirable volumes.

As specimens of brief and telling notes we give the following:

"IN YOUR OWN CONCEITS, Rom. xii. 16 (*παρ ἑαυτοῖς*). Lit., *with yourselves*; in your own opinion. See ch. xi. 25, and compare Acts xxvi. 8, 'incredible *with you*'—*i.e.*, in your judgment." An important explanation, as the Revised Version retains the ambiguous word "conceits."

"Beareth, 1 Cor. xii. 7 (στέγει). See on *suffer*, ch. ix. 12. It keeps out resentment as the ship keeps out water, or the roof the rain." Here the original meaning of στέγω is preserved in the explanation, where "beareth" is very indefinite.

"I shall be given, Philemon 22 (χαρισθήσομαι). A beautiful assumption of his correspondent's affection for him, is that his visit to them will be *a gracious gift* (χάρις)."

In the third volume is a masterly treatment of Paul's argument in the 9th, 10th and 11th chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, which ought to be published in a separate volume to increase its circulation and disabuse the minds of many, who have been taught that in the 9th chapter Paul makes God's dealings with men arbitrary, a teaching that proceeds from a narrow view of isolated texts and fails to see the connection of thought.

Dr. Vincent has established his reputation in these volumes as a careful, conscientious, and bold scholar, loving and honoring the Word, and in interpreting it, *nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.* We shall impatiently await his next volume, which will conclude the series.

Howard Crosby.

The Writers of Genesis and Related Topics Illustrating Divine Revelation. By Rev. E. Cowley, D.D. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1890, 12mo, pp. 184, $1.00.

This is another of those books undertaken with no particular technical knowledge such as should have made itself evident in the treatment of a subject which is only properly handled by a specialist. One might have expected to find something about the "documents" which are well-nigh universally recognized as the component parts of Genesis and the following books. Instead of this, the author says, "My suggestions of authorship are not based on Astruc, who died in 1766. . . . That his theory should form the basis of so much modern criticism surprises me."

His theory is that the patriarchs wrote the account of their own lives and times, and that Moses was the "redactor." "I shall endeavor, in these pages, to put the average reader in possession of the facts and methods whereby he can determine who were the probable writers of the first book of the Bible." But in the progress of his investigation, and in the statement of his conclusions, he says, in reference to the "differences of style and of verbal characteristics," "I shall waste no words on the orthography, syntax, or grammar of the writers," and, in fact, he has not. The whole seems to be constructed on the basis of the English Bible, with no inconvenient questions suggested by the Hebrew text.

Unfortunately, the writer has not seen fit to give us a table which should show who wrote the various parts of the book of Genesis. Such a table would have been a curiosity. The assertion is that, "He (Adam) may even have learned to write the account of his education and of Eve's creation before he died." The other patriarchs, down to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are supposed to have done the same, and to have carefully handed down their memoirs. He supposes evidently that the Flood was universal, and gets over the break at Noah by the aid of Berosus, who says that "Xisuthros—another name for Noah—was commanded, just before the Deluge, to bury all written documents known to him at Sippara; . . ." and so this ingenious theory progresses. At last the records were all in Egypt, and there were multiplied. In them Moses was duly indoctrinated. After his flight from Egypt "he became an inspired commentator of them," for he "had obtained copies of those records by purchase long before his flight." Such is the theory. But even the author says, "I can but think that the reader will here find that the last word has not been said, and that the application of modern discoveries to the Oracles of God will . . . . enable us to determine *who* were the writers of Genesis and of some other books." ". . . . I commend what is here offered to Professors Green and Harper, Bissell and Briggs, Cave and Cheyne, Dods and Driver, and to all other Bible students." The theory is claimed to have good support—"The literatures of the oldest nations sustain my view; a decent respect for the opinions of mankind supports it; the culture and good sense of the covenant-patriarchs support it." "The point at which we start, and to which we must return, is the probability that Abraham could read and write."

The book contains also a few other things: one short paper is mentioned thus in the Preface, "Hebrew and Greek Ethics was to correct Mr. Gladstone's third paper on Holy Scripture."

And in closing his preface, the author modestly says, "If my aim has been high, I trust I have been enabled to reach the mark."

C. R. Gillett.

New York.

Some Central Points in our Lord's Ministry. By Henry Wace, D.D., Principal of King's College, London, etc. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1890. 12mo, pp. xv., 352. Cloth, $1.75.

The Sermons in this volume—it is a volume of Sermons—were originally written for the pulpit of Lincoln's Inn Chapel, and therefore for an audience of exceptional thoughtfulness. There is probably no congregation in England for whom mere rhetoric would be less appropriate, and accordingly these short discourses are in style severely simple. They indicate careful thinking, and possess even an amount of originality which could scarcely be expected in the treatment of subjects which have been expounded and applied thousands of times over. Dr. Wace endeavors first of all to enable his readers to understand and appreciate the exact circumstances of each particular miracle or parable or instruction which he undertakes to apply to the necessities of our own spiritual life; and no method of studying our Lord's sayings and doings can possibly be more satisfactory. In fact, on any other plan, an expositor is only too likely to miss altogether the real meaning of Christ's words, and to use them simply as mottoes to which he may attach edifying but irrelevant reflections of his own. Moreover, as Dr. Wace remarks in his preface, this more accurate method of study furnishes indirectly a very forcible proof of the historic veracity of the Gospel narrative.

These Discourses are founded in a degree very far from common on a firm belief in the Incarnation; that is to say, the *whole* doctrine or mystery of the Incarnation. It is scarcely too much to say that a large portion of Christian teaching about our Lord's Ministry has for its object, however unintentionally, the destruction of that doctrine by the removal of its mysteriousness. A mystery may be defined as two or more facts which we know on equally conclusive evidence, but which we cannot possibly harmonize. Such is the mystery of human nature, which includes "matter" and "spirit"—freedom of will and subjection to fixed laws. We habitually *act* upon the confident belief of *both* these facts, but theoretically they are mutually exclusive; and every attempt to harmonize them ends in the temporary denial of one of the facts, which on the next occasion of action reasserts itself. Similarly, the doctrine of the Incarnation is the statement of two facts, the divine and human natures of Jesus Christ. Assuming the veracity of the Four Gospels, both these facts are equally certain; but on any conceivable *theory* they are mutually exclusive. Science, whether physical or metaphysical, resents contradictions, and exists for the very purpose of discovering harmony; therefore, Theology, as a science, is forever trying to resolve the mystery of the Incarnation. Thus we had, in the first centuries, Docetism in naked simplicity, frankly discarding a real humanity. Even in these last days we have so great a theologian as the late Canon Liddon asserting a humanity which in infancy knew all Hebrew literature, and was infallibly certain of the authorship of Psalm cx., and of the mode of composition of the Pentateuch. We have a humanity sublimated into a mere metaphysical entity to which no concrete human being ever does or can exactly correspond; like the "substance" of an orange when you have removed weight, specific gravity, shape, color, fragrance, rind, juice, seeds, and all sensible qualities. Now, Dr. Wace frankly admits the *mystery* of the Incarnation, and deals with the two facts of which the doctrine is the verbal expression *one by one*, dealing with them as they appear in the Evangelic History, and as they serve our spiritual needs.

This is admirably illustrated by his second Sermon on *Our Lord's Motive*, and the third on *Our Lord's Education*. Take, for example, this passage from the third, or the text, "They found Him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors," etc.

"The purpose for which He had lingered in the Temple is indicated by the occupation in which He was engaged when found by His parents. 'He was sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions.' He was taking advantage, it appears, of a custom that, on Sabbaths and feast days, such as those of the Paschal week, the members of the Temple Sanhedrin were wont to come out on the terrace of the Temple, and there to teach. In such popular instruction great latitude of questioning is believed to have been allowed; and it is in this audience, which sat on the ground, surrounding and questioning with the doctors, that the child Jesus was found.

"The point, then, of His answer lay in the consideration that it was inevitable He should take so precious an opportunity as was afforded by His presence in Jerusalem at the Paschal feast for seeking instruction from the doctors of the Temple in that Divine law in which they were the recognized authorities. If He was to fulfil His mission, that which He felt to be essential, and which His parents ought also to have felt to be essential, was that He should acquire the most thorough understanding of the sacred learning of His nation—of the Law and of the Prophets. Even by Him, in His human nature, the knowledge of His Father's business could not be attained by the inspiration of His own spirit alone, or by His personal intercourse with His Father in the intimate communings of His own heart. His Father's business was to be learned in the Temple; and in the Temple, not simply as a place of worship, but as a place in which all the legal, historical, and prophetical significance of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, of the history of His nation, and of its sacred Ceremonies, was best understood and taught. On this, and not merely on personal spiritual devotion or general moral truths, was our Lord's attention directed, for the purpose of increasing in wisdom, and with this object was He sitting among the doctors, seeking to imbue His human soul with the secrets of the sacred lore."

If the *Incarnate* Son of God were a *real* man—that is to say, if the Incarnation be a *Mystery*—it is obvious that our Lord's education must have been of the kind here described. If the Son of God did *not* submit Himself to the limitations of time and space, which include limitations of knowledge, then the Apocryphal Gospel of the Infancy is much more credible than the Gospel according to St. Luke. The abundant controversy in *The* (London) *Guardian* and elsewhere, arising out of the publication of *Lux Mundi*—and especially the letters of Archdeacon Denison—furnish the most unmistakable evidence of the unconscious Docetism of much of our modern theology. If Our Lord could be mistaken about a psalm, or ignorant of the mode of construction of the Pentateuch, He could not be God—that is the argument. Similarly, if there was a time in His earthly life when He did not know the Hebrew alphabet, He could not be God. Therefore, there never was a time when Jesus of Nazareth did not know the alphabet. This is exactly the ground taken by the writers of the Apocryphal Gospels (see *Gospel of Thomas*. vii., Cowper's Translation: "The Child, beginning at Alpha, said of Himself the twenty-two letters"). But if Jesus learned from the doctors, what marvel is it that He never even considered literary and critical questions which at that time had never been raised? The answer to the argument, "If our Lord did not know the authorship of a particular Psalm He was not divine," is plainly this: the word "divine," for the purpose of the argument, must mean "divine and *nothing* else;" whereas the mystery of the Incarnation is that our Lord was "divine and *something* else."

Again, in dealing with our Lord's *Temptation in the Wilderness*, Dr. Wace indicates the same sure grasp of the *mystery* of the Incarnation.

"One other consideration may be mentioned which should lead us to look in these simple words for experiences of the most profound import. Few things are more striking, in considering our Lord's teaching, than the earnestness with which again and again He dwells on the danger of temptation. The one human soul that overcame all temptation was also the one human soul that—it does not seem too much to say—dreaded it the most. Doubtless, His temptations were the most terrible of all, but so also was His ability to resist them; and that He should have uttered such repeated warnings against the danger of temptation is a momentous illustration of the spiritual and moral peril to which human nature is exposed. In one touching sentence He seems to sum up the whole of His experience in this word 'temptation.' 'Ye,' He said to His disciples, as though intimating the deepest of all bonds between Himself and them—'ye are they which have continued with Me in My temptations, and I appoint unto you a Kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me.' 'Father,' He exclaims, 'save Me from this hour,' but immediately submits His will by adding, 'but for this cause came I unto this hour.' 'Remove this cup from Me; nevertheless not My will, but Thine, be done.' What but the intensest experience of human struggle, the most profound sense of the shrinking of the human will from its most deadly trials, could have elicited such appeals to His Father? Accordingly, it is from the depth of His own experience of human weakness, in the hour of His own struggle with the most awful of all temptations, that He exclaims to His disciples, 'Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation. The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.' More than once, in that supreme moment, as if impelled by His own experience of the terrible struggle to which human nature might be exposed, does He utter that warning. At the commencement of that agony in the garden, 'when He was at the place, He said unto them, Pray that ye enter not into temptation.' Was it not only an apprehension of the struggle that was to follow, but a remembrance also of His great temptation at the outset of His ministry, which was partly present to His mind in that exclamation?"

It is scarcely too much to say that the treatment of the Temptation is the crucial test of a firm belief of the *mystery* of the Incarnation. A temptation is an inducement to do wrong. That God, as God, should be "tempted with evil" is wholly inconceivable; for not only does He infinitely loathe what is wrong, but is utterly incapable of being deceived by any of the disguises by which evil conceals itself from the true judgment of men.

A third example of Dr. Wace's firm hold and skilful application of this mystery is to be found in the Fourteenth Sermon—on the Story of the Woman of Canaan. Consider the following passage (pp. 259-261):

"It was contrary to the settled plan of our Lord's ministry that its blessings should, at this stage, be extended to any others than to the Jews; and consequently when this woman appealed to Him, she was asking Him to depart from an important principle of His ordinary conduct. His ministry was governed by certain laws, which had been determined for purposes of the highest import, and it was no easy matter for Him to depart from them.

"Looking at the matter from this point of view, it may be that the apparent harshness of our Lord is really an indication of a precisely opposite feeling. It may be that, in the first instance, He answered her not a word, because, so far as we may attribute human emotions to His conduct, her appeal raised in Him a conflict of feelings, and He knew not how to answer her. On the one hand, His merciful heart would be touched to its depths by the spectacle of her misery and her patient love for her daughter; on the other hand, He was restrained from yielding to His first impulse by the principles of His ministry. We may be permitted to apply to Him the language of the Evangelist on another occasion, and say that he feared He 'could not do' the work of mercy which He nevertheless longed to perform. He cannot explain it to the woman, and so He answers her not a word. When His disciples appeal to Him, He gives them at once the real reason of His hesitation—He was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel—and they, with His commission to them still fresh in their memories, feel that the argument cannot be answered. But when the woman refuses to be repulsed, and falls at His feet, He is compelled to tell her the reason also; and if we may conceive that conflict of feelings of which I have spoken, it may, perhaps, be felt to be a mark, not of harshness, but of the deepest sympathy, that our Lord should couch the reason in still severer terms. Deep feeling struggling to conceal itself is wont to seek protection in such severe expressions, which derive their very harshness from the depth of the emotion which they are endeavoring to conceal and to repress. All this appears perfectly natural, perfectly in harmony with the effect which would be produced in a mind of intense pity, checked by some law in the indulgence of its impulse of mercy. And so, when at length, as Luther says, the woman, by a master-stroke, ensnares our Lord in His own words, and turns His reason—His real reason—for refusing her into an argument for His help, we may well regard Him as really, and not apparently, overpowered by her faith and trust, and the deepest emotions of His heart break forth in His words, 'O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt.' The woman had actually succeeded, by her earnest importunity and trust, in inducing our Lord, at a time in some respects most inopportune, to infringe a settled principle of His ministry. She had wrestled with Him, against His own fixed determination, and had compelled Him, as it were, to give free play to His love, independently of the restraint of the laws under which He was for a time acting."

Sermons do not easily lend themselves to criticism, and these by Dr. Wace have here been considered only from a single point of view. But they are very far, indeed, above the average. The style is clear and manly, and the matter both indicates and suggests careful thought. WILLIAM KIRKUS.

BALTIMORE, MD.

ARTICLES ON ROMANISM: MONSIGNOR CAPEL; DR. LITTLEDALE. By the Rev. JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, S.T.D. New York: Thomas Whittaker, Bible House, 1890. Pp. 200, 12mo, cloth, $1.

In this neat little volume three essays by the author are put in more permanent form and more accessible shape than in the files of the *American Church Review*, in which they were first published. Two of the articles have reference to Monsignor Capel; the first being a review of his "Catholic: an Essential and Exclusive Attribute of the True Church," followed by certain correspondence drawn out by its appearance in print; the second being a continuation and further expansion of the former article, with a reply to the "Open Letter" of the Monsignor.

The third essay is a review of Dr. Richard F. Littledale's "Petrine Claims," in the shape of a running commentary upon the book.

The whole is enriched by an index, which is reasonably full. C. R. GILLETT.

NEW YORK.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Achelis, Hans, Dr. Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechtes. 1 Buch: Die Canones Hippolyti. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur von Osc. von Gebhardt und Adolf Harnack. Band VI., Heft 4.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1890. Pp. viii., 295, 8vo, 9.50 mk. (Complete, 26.50 mk.)

Adams, Emma H. Savonarola. The Florentine Martyr. San Francisco: Pacific Press, 1890. Pp. vi., 160, 12mo, 50 cts.

Aitchison, J. Signa Christi: Evidences of Christianity set forth in the Person and Work of Christ. London: Cassell, 1890. Pp. 302, 8vo, 5s.

Alexander, G. G. Confucius, the Great Teacher: A study. London: Kegan Paul, 1890. Pp. 332, 8vo, 6s.

Appeal to Unitarians : Being a record of religious experiences. By a convert from Unitarianism. London : Longmans, 1890. 8vo, 3s.

Archibald, Andrew W., Rev. The Bible Verified : with an introductory note by Ransom B. Welch, D.D. Philadelphia : Presb. Bd. Pub., 1890. Pp. ii., 215, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Atkins, Frederick A. Moral Muscle, and How to Use It. A brotherly chat with young men. With an introduction by the Rev. Thain Davidson, D.D. New York and Chicago : Revell, 1890. Pp. viii., 82, 12mo, 75 cts.

Bachmann, Johs., Dr. Präparation und Commentar zum Deutero-Jesaja, mit wortgetreuer Uebersetzung, 1. Heft. Kap. xl.-xlviii. Berlin : Mayer, 1890. Pp. 72, 8vo, 1.20 mk. Präparation und Commentar zur Genesis, 1. Heft. Kap. i.-xi. Berlin : Mayer, 1890. Pp. 50, 8vo, 80 pf. Präparation zu den kleinen Propheten. 4. Heft : Uebersetzung und Dispositionen von Joel, Micha, Obadja, Amos. Berlin : Mayer, 1890. Pp. 38, 8vo, 50 pf. (Hefte 1–4, 2.60 mk.)

Baird, J. Studies in the Spiritual Life. London : Simpkin, 1890. Pp. 274, 8vo, 4s.

Barry, A., Rt. Rev., Bp. Lectures on Christianity and Socialism, Delivered at the Lambeth Baths in February and March, 1890. London : Cassell, 1890. Pp. 182, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Basmajain, K. H. Social and Religious Life in the Orient. With numerous illustrations. New York : Am. Tr. Soc., 1890. Pp. 246, 12mo, $1.00.

Bassenge, E. Die Sendung Augustins zur Bekehrung der Angelsachsen. (596–604 n. Chr.) Leipzig : Fock, 1890. Pp. 75, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Bellesheim, Adolph, Dr. Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Ireland von der Einführung des Christenthums bis auf die Gegenwart. 2. Band von 1509 bis 1690. Mit einer Karte Irlands vom Jahre 1570. Mainz : Kirchheim 1890. Pp. xxxv., 772, 8vo, 16.60 mk. (Bände 1 and 2, 31.60 mk.)

Bersier, Eugène. Quelques pages de l'histoire des Huguenots. Prêface par Auguste Sabatier. Paris, 1890.

Bertrand, Joseph. Blaise Pascal. Paris : Lévy, 1890. 8vo, 7.50 fr.

Bibb, C. W. Sharpened Arrows and Polished Stones ; a collection of Scripture texts and illustrations for the Christian worker and the home. With an introduction by the Rev. A. J. Gordon. London : Hodder, 1890. Pp. 320, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Bickford, J. An Autobiography of Christian Labor in the West Indies, Demerara, Victoria, New South Wales, and South Australia. 1838–88. London : Kelly, 1890. Pp. 412, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Blackall, C. R., and Mrs. E. L. Stories about Jesus. Philadelphia : Griffith, 1890. Pp. 271, 8vo, $1.25.

Bonney, T. G., Rev. Abbeys and Churches of England and Wales ; descriptive, historical, pictorial. Second series : London : Cassell, 1890. Pp. 284, 8vo, 21s.

Booth, Mrs. Salvation Army in Relation to the Church and State, and eight other addresses delivered at Cannon Street Hotel. London : Salvation Army, 1890. Pp. 92, 12mo, 6d.

Booth, W. Training of Children ; or, how to make the children into saints and soldiers of Jesus Christ. London : Salvation Army, 1890. 12mo, 1s. 6d.

Boston Homilies. Short Sermons on the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1891. By members of the alpha chapter of the Convocation of Boston University. First series. New York : Hunt & Eaton, 1890. Pp. viii., 408, 8vo, $1.25.

Boulfroy, A., Abbé. Rome, ses monuments, ses souvenirs. Rome chrétienne, Rome païenne, Rome souterraine, Rome artistique. Lille : Desclée, 1890. Pp. 308, 8vo.

Buhl, Frants, Prof., Dr., Leipzig. Kanon und Text des Alten Testamentes. Leipzig : W. Faber, 1891, 8vo. Pp. vi., 262, 6 mk.

Chabauty, E. A., Abbé. Études scripturales, patristiques, théologiques et philosophiques sur l'avenir de l'Église catholique selon le plan divin, ou la Régénération de l' humanité et la Rénovation de l'Univers. Tome II. Poitiers : Oudin, 1890. Pp. vi., 473, 8vo.

Chevalier, Jules. Memoire historique sur les hérésies en Dauphiné avant le XVIe siècle, accompagné de documents inédits sur les sorciers et les Vaudois. Valence : Lechevalier, 1890. 8vo, 5 fr.

Clair, C., Père. La Vie de saint Ignace de Loyola, d'après Pierre Ribadeneira, son premier historien. Paris : Plon, 1890. Pp. iv., 464, 4to, 20 fr.

Clemen, Carl, Dr. Die religions philosophische Bedeutung des stoisch-christlichen Eudämonismus in Justino Apologie. Studien und Vorarbeiten. Leipzig : Hinrichs, 1890. Pp. viii., 158, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

Cochrane, Robert. Beneficent and Useful Lives. London : Chambers, 1890. Pp. 280, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Cölln, Ed. von. Dr. Martinus Luther. Von der Clausur zur Ehe. 1505–25. Ein Reformationsepos. Danzig : Hinstorff, 1890. Pp. 189, 8vo, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Coignet, Mme. C. La Réforme française avant les guerres civiles. 1512–59. Paris : Fischbacker, 1890. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Couard, Herm., Pastor. Die Briefe Pauli an die Thessalonicher, an den Timotheus, Titus, und Philemon. (Das Neue Testament, Bibellesern durch Umschreibung und Erläuterung erklärt, Band VIII.) Potsdam : Stein, 1890. 8vo, 1.40 mk. (Bände., I.-VIII., 13.50 mk.)

Critical Review of Theological and Philosophical Literature. No. 1. London : Simpkin, 1890. (Edinburgh : Clark.) Pp. 106, 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Crolet, L., L'Abbé. Doctrine philosophique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin, resumée d'après le docteur Stœckl. Besançon : Outhenin-Chalandre, 1890. Pp. xix., 398, 18mo.

Dale, R. W., LL.D. The Living Christ and the Four Gospels. New York : Armstrong, 1890. Pp. xii., 299, 12mo, $1.50.

Delff, H. K. Hugo, Dr. Neue Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des vier Evangeliums. Supplement zu der Schrift "Das vier Evangelium, eine authentische Bericht über Jesus von Nazareth." Husum : Delff, 1890. Pp. 37, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Douglas, George C. M. The Six Intermediate Minor Prophets. (Handbooks for Bible classes.) Edinburgh : Clark. (New York : Scribner & W.), 1890. Pp. 157, 8vo, 60 cts.

Dresdner, Albert, Ph.D. Kultur und Sittengeschichte der italienischen Geistlichkeit im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert. Breslau : W. Koebner, 1890. Pp. xvi., 392, 8vo, 10. mk.

Druschky, Pastor Ueber den Sinn und den Gedankengang in den Reden Jesu Lucas, Cap. 15. und 16. Ein Versuch. Erlangen : Böhme, 1891. Pp. iv., 106, 12mo, 1.20 mk.

Drysdale, A. H., Early Bible Songs. (By-paths of Bible knowledge.) London : Tract Soc., 1890. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Elbel, P. Benj., O. S. Fr. Theologia moralis per modum conferentiarum. Novis curis ed. Lect. P. F. Irenæus Bierbaum, O. S. Fr. Vol. I. (3 partes) Pars I. De actis humanis, conscientia, legibus atque peccatis. Paderborn : Bonifacius Druckerei, 1891. (1890.) Pp. xiii., 254, 8vo, 2.25 mk.

Evers, G. G. Martin Luther. Lebens und Charakterbild, vom ihm Selbst gezeichnet in seinen eigenen Schriften und Correspondenzen. Heft. 13. Bd. VI. Pp. 1–368. Mainz : Kirchheim, 1890. 8vo, 3.40 mk.

Faggi, Ad. La filosofia dell' inconsciente metafisica e morale. Firenze, 1890. Pp. 205 8vo, 5 mk.

Farrar, F. W., Rev., D.D. The Minor Prophets. (Men of the Bible Series.) New York : Randolph, 1890. Pp. vii., 245, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Faunce, D. W., Rev., D.D. Prayer as a Theory and Fact. New York : Am. Tr. Soc., 1890. Pp. ii., 256, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Favre, Mme. Jules, née Velten. La Morale de Cicéron. Paris : Fischbacker, 1890. 12mo, 4 fr.

Fester, Rich. Rousseau und die deutsche Geschichtsphilosophie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Idealismus. Stuttgart : Göschen, 1890. Pp. x., 340, 8vo, 5.50 mk.

Fox, Luther A. Evidence of a Future Life. Philadelphia : Luth. Publ. Soc., 1890. Pp. vi., 378, 12mo.

France, l'Abbé. Kerduel, ou les Missionaires du XVIIe siècle au pays de Lannion. Saint-Brieuc : Prud'homme. 1890. Pp. 296, 18mo.

Friedlaender, Levi, Rabbi. La Tosephta, livraison : Naschim, avec lecommentaire : Heschek Schlomoh, tirée d'un grand nombre d'œuvres et manuscrits. Corrigée, nouvellement classée, completement simplifiée et expliquée avec l'aide des sources talmudique et littéraire. (Vol. II. in hebr. Sprache.) Pressbourg, 1890. Pp. xvi., 248, 8vo, 3 mk. (Vol. I. and II., 6.40 mk.)

Fuerst, Julius, Dr., Rabbiner. Glossarium Graeco-Hebraeum oder der griechische Wörterschatz der judischen Midraschwerke. Ein Beitrag zur Kultur-und Altertumskunde. 1ste Lieferung. Strassburg : Trübner, 1890. Pp. 1–48, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Ganser, Ant. Die Wahrheit. Kurze Darlegung der letzten und wahren Weltprincipien. Entwurf zu einer transcendentalen Logik. Graz : Leuschner, 1890. Pp. 54, 8vo, 1.80 mk.

Gilbert, Jessie S., Rev., A.M. Blessed are They ; or, thoughts on the beatitudes. Paterson, N. J. : Herrick. 1890. Pp. 69, 12mo.

Gladstone, W. E., Right Hon., M.P. The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture. From *The Sunday-School Times.* Philadelphia : Wattles, 1890. Pp. 358, 12mo, $1.00.

Glazebrook, M. G. Lessons from the Old Testament. Senior course. Vol. II. The death of Saul to Nehemiah. London : Percival, 1890. Pp. 346, 12mo, 2s 6d.

Goldziher, Ign. Muhammedanische Studien. II. Theil. Halle a. S. Niemeyer. Pp. x., 420, 12 mk. (Theile I. und II. 20 mk.)

Gray, E. W. The New Religion : A Gospel of Love. Chicago : Thorne Pub. Co., 1890. Pp. xiv., 429, 8vo, $7.50.

Green, R. The Mission of Methodism : Being the twentieth Fernley Lecture, delivered in Bristol, Aug. 4, 1890. London : Wesl. Conf. Office, 1890. Pp. 234, 8vo, 2s.

Griffis, William Elliott, D.D. Honda the Samurai. A Story of Modern Japan. Boston and Chicago : Cong. S. S. & Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. 390, 12mo, $1.50.

Grimm, Ed. Zur Geschichte des Erkenntnissproblems. Von Bacon zu Hume. Leipzig : Friedrich, 1890. Pp. xii., 596, 8vo, 12 mk.

Guerin, Louis, Abbé. Deux grands Chrétiens. Le Docteur A. Fabre et Charles Ranque. Lille : Desclée, 1890. Pp. 235, 8vo.

Hamerling, Rob. Die Atomistik des Willens. Beiträge zur Kritik der modernen Erkenntniss. 2. Bände. Hamburg : Verlagsanstalt, 1890. Pp. xix., 297, v., 270, 8vo, 12 mk.

Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament. (Holtzmann, Lipsius, Schmiedel, und Soden.) II. 1. Schmiedel, P. W., Prof.—1, 2. Thessalonicherbrief—1. 2. Korintherbrief. (Erste Hälfte.) Freiburg i.-B. : Mohr. 1890. Pp. 1–112, 8vo, 1 80 mk.

Hansjacob, Heinr., Prof., Dr. St. Martin zu Freiburg als Kloster und Pfarrei. Geschichtlich dargestellt Mit einem Titelbild, etc. Freiburg i. Br. : Herder, 1890. Pp. vii., 206, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

Harris, H. The Old Testament Scriptures. London : Frowde, 1890. Pp. 42, 12mo, 1s.

Harris, J. Rendel. Biblical Fragments from Mount Sinai, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1890. 4to, 10s. 6d.

Hatch, E. The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church. (Hibbert Lectures, 1888.) Edited by A. M. Fairbairn. London : Williams & N., 1890. Pp. 366, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Hayes, Lucy Webb. A Memorial, by Mrs. John Davies. As read at the Annual Meeting of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, held at Indianapolis, November, 1889. Poem : In Memoriam, by Miss M. A. Lathbury. Memorial paper, by Mrs. R. S. Rust. Addresses by Mrs. Hayes delivered at several annual meetings. Cincinnati : Cranston, 1890. Pp. 104, 12mo.

Henner, Camilio, Dr. Beiträge zur Organisation und Competenz der päpstlichen Ketzergerichte. Leipzig : Duncker, 1890. Pp. xii., 383, 8vo, 8.80 mk.

Hettinger, Franz, Dr. Timotheus. Briefe an einen jungen Theologen. Freiburg i. Br. : Herder, 1890. Pp. xii., 549, 8vo, 4 mk.

Hilaire, Saint Antoine de Padoue. Sa légende primitive et autres pièces historiques, avec des sermons inédits et nouveaux et un Manuel de dévotion. Neuville-sous-Montreuil : Duquat, 1890. Pp. li., 290, 8vo.

Houghton, Louise Seymour. The Life of Christ. New York : Am. Tr. Soc. 1890. Pp. 295, 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Hutton, Hugh, Rev. A Private Book of Devotions. Boston : Lee & S., 1890. Pp. vi., 134, 16mo, 30 cts.

Inglis, J., Rev., D.D. Bible Illustrations from the New Hebrides : with notices of the progress of the Mission. New York : Nelsons, 1890. Pp. vi., 356, 8vo, cloth, $1.75.

Jastrow, M., Ph.D. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and Midrashic Literature. Part IV. New York : Putnams, 1890. Pp. 289–384, 8vo, $2.00.

Johnson, E. The Rise of Christendom. London : Kegan Paul, 1890. Pp. 516, 8vo, 14s.

Kallmeyer, Thdr., Pastor. Die evangelischen Kirchen und Prediger Kurlands. Ergänzt, bis zur Gegenwart fortgesetzt und im Auftrage der kurländischen Gesellschaft für Literatur und Kunst herausgegeben von Dr. G. Otto. Mitau : (Besthorn), 1890. Pp. xvi., 552, 8vo, 12 mk.

Kellner, Carl Adam Heinr. Chronologiæ Tertullianæ supplementa. Bonn : Hanstein, 1890. Pp. 34, 4to, 1.20 mk.

Kennedy, Jas., D.D. Christ in Song. Boston : Bradley & W., 1890. Pp. 352, 12mo.

Kitchin, W. C. Paoli. The Last of the Missionaries. A picture of the overthrow of the Christians in Japan in the seventeenth century. With illustrations by G. A. Traver and Henry Bouche. New York : Bonner, 1890. Pp. 408, 12mo, $1.00.

Klein, Félix, Abbé. Les Villages d'Arabes chrétiens. Fontainebleu : Pongé, 1890. Pp. 71, 16mo, 80 ctm.

Knight, W. Essays in Philosophy, Old and New. Boston : Houghton, M. & Co., 1890. Pp. i., 367, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Kristeller, Samuel. Der ethische Tractat der Mischnah Pirke Aboth d. i Sprüche der Väter übersetzt. Berlin : Speyer & Peters, 1890. Pp. viii., 87, 12mo, 1 50 mk.

Kühner, K. Augustin's Anschauung von der Erlösungsbedeutung Christi im Verhältniss zur vor-augustin'schen Erlösungslehre bei den griechischen und lateinischen' Vätern. Heidelberg : Groos, 1890. Pp. lii., 69, 8vo, 1 mk.

Kukula, Rich. C., Dr. Die Mauriner Ausgabe des Augustinus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Literatur und der Kirche im Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV. 2. Theil. Wien : Tempsky, 1890. Pp. 66. 8vo, 1.30 mk. (1. und 2. Thle. 3.10 mk.)

Laache, N. J. Johannes's Aabenbarings Inddeling og Indhold. Veiledning til dens Foostaaelse. Throndhjem : Bogh, 1890. Pp. 31, 8vo.

Laengin, Georg. Die biblischen Vorstellungen vom Teufel und ihr religiöser Werth. Ein Beitrag zu der Frage : Giebt es einen Teufel ? Ist der Teufel ein Gegenstand des christlichen Glaubens ? Leipzig : Wigand, 1890. Pp. vi., 97, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Lagarde, Paul de. Mittheilungen. 3. Band. Göttingen : Dieterich, 1889. Pp. 376, 8vo, 10 mk. (Theile 1–3, 32 mk.)

Langen, Jos., Prof., Dr. Die Klemensromane. Ihre Entstehung und ihre Tendenzen, aufs neue untersucht. Gotha : Perthes, 1890. Pp. vii., 167, 8vo, 3.60 mk.

Ledrain, E. La Bible. Traduction nouvelle d'après les textes Hébreu et Grec. Tome VI. Les Prophètes II. ; Ezéchiel ; les douze prophètes; Baruch; Daniel; Epitre de Jérémie. Paris: Lemerre, 1890. 8vo, 7.50 fr.

Lenk, H. Ist die heilige Schrift wirklich Gottes Wort, oder, enthält sie bloss Gottes Wort ? Dresden : Naumann, 1890. Pp. 64, 12mo, 1 mk.

L'Hermite, L. Les saintes causes. Paris : 1890. Pp. 253, 18mo, 2 fr.

Lightfoot, Bp. Ordination Addresses and Counsels to Clergy. London: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. 306, 8vo, 6s.

Loehr, Max. Introductionis ad commentarium de Threnis Jeremiæ capita nonnella. Dissertatio inauguralis theological Königsberg i. Pr.: Koch, 1890. Pp. 35, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Löhr, P. Die Offenbarung Johannis. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Kritik und Erklärung. Leipzig: Böhme, 1890. Pp. 85, 8vo, 1 mk.

Loewenthal, Alb. Dominicus Gundisalvi und sein psychologisches Compendium. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der philosophischen Literatur bei Arabern, Christen und Juden. 1. Theil. Inaugural-Dissertation. Königsberg, i. Pr.: Koch, 1890. Pp. 35, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Lumby, J. Rawson, D.D. The Acts of the Apostles (The Smaller Cambridge Bible for schools). New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp., 160, 16mo.

Mackay, W. A., Rev. Outpourings of the Spirit ; or, a Narrative of Spiritual Awakenings in Different Ages and Countries. Philadelphia: Presb. Bd. Publ., 1890. Pp. ii., 141, 24mo, cloth, 40 cts.

McPherson, J. G. Summer Sundays in a Strathmore Parish: Sermons preached in Rathven Parish Church. London: Blackwoods. 1890. 8vo, 5s.

Mally, Johs., Dr. Historia sacra Antiqui testamenti cum introductione in ejusdem testamenti libros sacros. Gran : Buzárovits, 1890. Pp. vi., 293, v., 8vo, 3.20 mk.

Martyn, Carlos. William E. Dodge, the Christian Merchant. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1890. Pp. vii., 349, 12mo, $1.50.

Matheson, George, Rev. Spiritual Development of St. Paul. New York: Whittaker, 1890. Pp. vi., 324, 12mo, $2.00.

Matthews, Frank J. Father Matthew: His Life and Times. With a portrait. New York : Cassell & Co., 1890. Pp. viii., 223, 12mo, $1.00.

Maudslay, A. Old Thoughts for Young Brains. (On preaching and teaching, spring-time of life, education.) London: Simpkin, 1890. Pp. 202, 8vo, 5s.

Miller, J. R. Bits of Pasture; or, Handfuls of Grass for the Lord's Hungry Sheep. Being selections from sermons of—. Culled and arranged by Mary A. Butler. Philadelphia: Presb. Bd. Pub., 1890. Pp. 255, 16mo, 60 cts.

Mills, B. Fay, Rev. Power from on High. Do we need it? What is it ? Can we get it ? An address delivered at the Ninth International Christian Endeavor Convention. New York and Chicago : Revell, 1890. Pp. 32, 16mo, 20 cts.

Mission (la) de Vizgapatam ; par un missionaire de Saint-François-de-Sales. Annecy : Nicrat, 1890. Pp. xvi., 536, 8vo.

Mitchell, Elizabeth H. Forty Days in the Holy Land: before and after. With six illustrations. London: Kegan Paul, 1890. Pp. 210, 8vo, 6s.

Moulin-Eckart, Rich., Dr., Graf du. Lendegar, Bischof von Autun. Ein Beitrag zur fränkischen Geschichte des siebenten Jahrhunderts. Breslau : Koebner, 1890. Pp. v., 108, 8vo, 2.80 mk.

Musick, Thomas H. The Genesis of Nature. New York: Alden, 1890. Pp. 377, 12mo.

Naumann, O., Pastor. Das erste Buch der Bible, nach seiner inneren Einheit und Echtheit dargestellt. Gütersloh : Bertelsmann, 1890. Pp. viii., 386, 8vo, 5 mk.

Naville, Ernest. Le Libre arbitre. Étude philosophique. Paris: Fischbacker, 1890. 8vo, 6 fr.

Neumayr, Emmanuel, Pastor. Theorie des Strebens nach Thomas von Aquin. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Psychologie. 2. Theile. Leipzig : Fock, 1890. Pp. 44, 33, 8vo, 80 pf.

Nick, H. Notion de la Metanoïa d'après le Nouveau Testament et l'expérience chrétienne. Thèse. Montaubon: Granié, 1890. Pp. 80, 8vo.

Nikel, Johs., Dr. Die Lehre des Alten Testamentes über die Cherubim und Seraphim. Inaugural-Dissertation. Leipzig: Fock, 1890. Pp. 101, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Noeldechen, E. Tertullian dargestellt. Gotha : Perthes, 1890. Pp. viii., 496, 8vo, 9 mk.

Nösgen, C. F., Prof., Dr. Geschichte der neutestamentlichen Offenbarung. (In 2 Bänden.) 1. Band. Geschichte Jesu Christi. 1. Hälfte. München: Beck, 1891 (1890.) Pp. xii., 322, 8vo, 6 mk.

Osborn, H. S., Prof., LL.D. A Class-Book of Biblical History and Geography; with numerous maps. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., 1890. Pp. 312, 12mo, $1.25.

Paetsch, Adolf. Skizzen aus der jüdischen Priestergeschichte. Kritische Bemerkungen zu biblischen Schriften. Leipzig : Siegismund, 1890. Pp. 50, 8vo, 60 pf.

Page, Jesse. Henry Martyn. His Life and Labors in Cambridge, India, Persia. Illustrated by H. R. Miller, etc. New York and Chicago : Revell, 1890. Pp. viii., 160, 12mo, 75 cts.

Painter, F. V. N. Luther on Education ; including an historical introduction and a translation of the Reformer's two most important educational treatises. Philadelphia: Lutheran Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. ii., 282, 12mo, $1.00.

Peiser, Fel. Ernst. Jurisprudentiæ babylonicæ quæ supersunt. Commentatio assyriologica. Cöthen. (Berlin: Peiser. 1890. Pp. 41, 8vo, 2 mk.)

Peloubet, F. N., Rev., D.D. and M. A. Select Notes. A Commentary on the International Lessons for 1891. Explanatory, illustrative, doctrinal, and practical. With illustrations, maps, pictures, chronology of the Old Testament, chronology and harmony of the life of Christ, suggestions to teachers, library references. New York : Ward & D., 1890. Pp. 387, 8vo.

Peloubet, F. N., Rev., D.D. (and Capron, Mary J.). The International Question Book and Scholars' Aid on the Uniform Series of the Sabbath-School Lessons Adopted by the International Committee for 1891. Part I. For the older scholars, pp. 212. Part II. Intermediate, pp. 191. Part III. For the youngest scholars. By Mary J. Capron, pp. 204. New York : Ward & D., 1890. 12mo.

Pesch, Chrn., S. J. Gott und Götter. Eine Studie zur vergleichenden Religionswissenschaft. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1890. Pp. vii., 128, 8vo, 1.70 mk.

Pfleiderer, O. The Development of Theology in Germany since Kant, and its Progress in Great Britain since 1825. Translated under the author's supervision by J. Frederick Smith. (Library of Philosophy.) London: Sonnenschein, 1890. Pp. xii., 403, 8vo. (New York: Macmillan, $2.75.)

Puchstein, Otto. Pseudohethitische Kunst. Ein Vortrag. Berlin: Reimer, 1890. Pp. 22, 8vo, 1 mk.

Rady, J. B., Prof. Die Reformatoren in ihrer Beziehung zur Doppelehe des Landgrafen Philipp. Nach dem in den "Publicationen aus den preussischen Staatsarchiven" veröffentlichen Briefwechsel des Landgrafen mit Bucer dargestellt. Frankfurt a. M.: Foesser, 1890. Pp. iv., 131, 8vo, 2.25 mk.

Rauschenplat, Adf.. Dr. Christenthum und Atomtheorie. Hamburg: Weitbrecht, 1890. Pp. 43, 8vo, 1 mk.

Renan, Ernest. Histoire du peuple d'Israël. Tome III. Paris: Lévy, 1890. 8vo, 7.50 fr. (Vol I. appeared 1887, Vol. II., 1888.)

Ritten, H. Dreissig Jahre protestantischer Mission in Japan. Berlin: Haack, 1890. Pp. xii , 126, 8vo, 2 mk.

Rosenthal, Ludwig A., Rabbi, Dr. Ueber den Zusammenhang der Mischna. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Entstehungsgeschichte. I. Theil : Die Sadduzäer Kämpfe und die Mischnasammlungen vor dem Auftreten Hillel's. Strassburg i. E. : Trübner, 1890. Pp. 95, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

Ross, Charles B., Rev., M.A. Our Father's Kingdom. Lectures on the Lord's Prayer. New York: Scribners, 1890. Pp. 189, 12mo, $1.00.

Roth, P. La personne du Christ, d'après ses paroles. Thèse. Montauban : Granić, 1890. Pp. 76, 8vo.

Sadler, M. F. The Epistles of St. Paul to Titus, Philemon, and the Hebrews, with notes, critical and practical. London: Bell & D., 1890. Pp. 310, 8vo, 6s.

Saegmüller, J. B., Dr. Die Papstwahlen und die Staaten von 1447–1555. (Nikolaus V. bis Paul IV.) Eine kirchenrechtlich-historische Untersuchung über den Aufang des staatlichen Rechtes der Exklusive in der Papstwahl. Tübingen: Laupp, 1890. Pp. vi., 238, 8vo, 4.80 mk.

Sandoval, A. de. Historia de Santa Catalina de Siena. Madrid : 1890.

Scheikl, Franz, Dr. Bilder aus der Zeit der Gegenreformation in Oesterreich, 1564–1618. Gotha : Perthes, 1890. Pp. vii., 51, 8vo, 1 mk.

Schenkl, H. Bibliotheca patrum latinorum Britannica. I. Wien: Tempsky, 1890. Pp. 80, 8vo.

Schiffers, M. J., Rect., Dr. Amwâs, das Emmaus des heiligen Lucas, 160 Stadien von Jerusalem. Mit Titelbild, ein Grundplan und eine Karte von Judäa. Freiburg i. Br., Herder, 1890. Pp. viii., 236, 8vo, 3 mk.

Schot, J. C. Moslemen en Christendom. Leiden : 1890. Pp. iv., 90, 8vo, 3.10 mk.

Schrader, Eberhard, in Verbindung mit L. Abel, C. Bezold, P. Jensen, F. E. Peiser, H. Winckler. Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek. Sammlung von assyrischen und babylonischenc Texten in Umschrift und Uebersetzung. 3. Band, 2. Hälfte. Berlin: Reuter, 1890. Pp. iv., 147, 8vo, 6 mk. (Bänden 1. 2. und 3., II.: 27 mk.)

Schubert, Hans von, Dr. Die evangelische Trauung, ihre Geschichtliche Entwicklung und gegenwärtige Bedeutung. Berlin: Reuther, 1890. Pp. xiv., 158, 8vo, 3.60 mk.

Schwarzlose, Karl, Dr. Der Bilderstreit. Ein Kampf der griechischen Kirche um ihre Eigenart und um ihre Freiheit. Gotha : Perthes, 1890. Pp. viii., 266, 8vo, 5 mk.

Sepp, J. W. B., Prof., Dr. Die Religion der alten Deutschen und ihr Fortbestand in Volkssagen, Aufzügen und Festbräuchen bis zur Gegenwart. Mit durchgreifenden Religionsvergleichung. München : Lindauer, 1890. Pp. xx., 419, 8vo, 6 mk.

Sprague, Philo W., Rev. Christian Socialism, What and Why ? What is socialism? What are its causes? How can the great social and economic changes it involves be brought about by just and orderly methods? With appendix. Address of the Bishop of Durham on socialism. New York: Dutton, 1890. Pp. vi., 204, 16mo, 50 cts.

Stearns, Lewis French., Rev., D.D. The Evidences of Christian Experience ; being the Ely Lectures for 1890. New York: Scribners, 1890. Pp. viii., 473, 12mo, $2.00.

Steere, Bp. Notes of Sermons on the Psalms, etc. Edited by Rev. R. M. Heanley, with an introductory letter by Rev. F. Paget. Vol. III., London: Bell & S., 1890. Pp. 360, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Stevens, George B., Ph.D., D.D. A Short Exposition on the Epistle to the Galatians. Designed as a text-book for class-room use and private study. Hartford: Student Pub. Co., 1890. Pp. vii., 240, 8vo.

Stirling, J. H. Philosophy and Theology ; being the first Edinburgh University Gifford Lectures. Edinburgh: Clark, 1890. Pp. xvi., 406, 8vo. (New York: Scribner & W., $3.75.)

Sutter, J. Luther and the Cardinal. An historical and biographical tale of the Reformation in Germany. London: 1890. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Thomas, W. H. Mormon Saints. With illustrations. (A study of Mormonism.) London: Houlston, 1890. Pp. 190, 12mo, 1s.

Thompson, Leila. Modern Miracles; being manifestations of God's love and power. With a preface by the Rev. Alexander McLaren, D.D. New York: Carters, 1890. Pp. 156, 12mo.

Through the Quicksands of Doubt to the Rock of Belief. By an English rector. London: Griffith, 1890. 8vo, 1s.

Tidball, Thos. A., D. D. Christ in the New Testament. With an introduction by S. D. McConnell, D. D. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. ix., 357, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Toy, Crawford Howell, Prof. (Harvard). Judaism and Christianity. A sketch of the progress of thought from Old Testament to New Testament. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1890. Pp. xvii., 456, 8vo, $3.00.

Trede, Th. Das Heidentum in der römischen Kirche. Bilder aus dem religiösen und sittlichen Leben Suditaliens. 3. Theil. Gotha: Perthes, 1890. Pp. iii., 426, 8vo, 6 mk. 1–3 Theile, 16 mk.

Trümpelmann, A. Die Predigt am Muldenstein. Episode aus Luther's Leben in dramatischem Form. Leipzig: Richter, 1890. Pp. viii., 8vo, 20 pf.

Tux, Norbertus a. Compendium theologiæ fundamentalis ope scriptorum Rmi. P. Alberti a Bulsano, aliorumque probatorum auctorum concinnavit et in usum præprimis scholæ. adaptavit—. Vol. I. De religione et revelatione. Brixen: Kathol.-polit. Pressvereins, 1890. Pp. viii., 332, 8vo, 3.50 mk.

Tyng, Charles Rockland. Record of the Life and Work of the Rev. Stephen Higginson Tyng, D.D., and history of St. George's Church, New York, at the close of his rectorship. Compiled by his son, ——. New York: Dutton, 1890. Pp. 682, 8vo, $3.50.

Vernet, A., Th. B. Les Généalogies de Jésus-Christ (Thèse). Montauban: Granié, 1890. Pp. 63, 8vo.

Vilmar, Aug. Frdr. Christ., Dr. Collegium biblicum. Praktische Erklärung der heiligen Schrift Alten und Neuen Testaments. Aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlass der akademischen Vorlesungen, herausgegeben von Prof. Chrn. Müller. Des Alten Testaments. 1. Theil. 1. Lieferung (in 15 Lieferungen). Neue Ausgabe. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1890. Pp. vi., 192. 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Vincent, John H., Bishop. Studies in Young Life: A series of word-pictures and practical papers. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1890. Pp. vi., 254, 12mo.

Wace, Henry, D.D. Some Central Points on Our Lord's Ministry. New York: Whittaker, 1890. Pp. xv., 352, 12mo, $1 25.

Walker, Norman L., Rev., D.D. The Church Standing of the Children. New York: Scribner & W., 1890. Pp. 32, 16mo, 25 cts.

Walther, Wilh., Pastor. Luther's Bibelübersetzung kein Plagiat. Leipzig: Deichert, 1890. Pp. iii., 47, 8vo, 80 pf.

Watts, Robert, Prof., D.D., LL.D. A New Apologetic; or, the down grade in criticism, theology, and science. New York: Scribners, 1890. Pp. xxv., 358, 12mo, $2.25.

Wendt, H. H., Dr., Prof., in Heidelberg. Der Anhalt der Lehre Jesu. Darstellender Theil des Werkes "Die Lehre Jesu." Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1890. Pp. xiv., 678, 8vo, 12 mk. (Complete, 19 mk.)

Whiton, J. M. What of Samuel? (A view of Samuel as prophet, king-maker and politician.) London: Clarke, 1890. Pp. 74, 8vo, 1s.

Wigand, Adb, Pastor. August Neander's Leben (1789–1850). 2 Ausgabe. Erfurt: Bartholomäus, 1890. Pp. x., 152, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Wilson, Edward L. In Scripture Lands. New views of sacred places. With one hundred and fifty illustrations from original photographs by the author. New York: Scribners, 1890. Pp. xvi., 336, 8vo, $3.00.

Wimpffen, Max Frhr., v., Dr. Kritische Worte über den Buddhismus. Wien: Konegen, 1891 (1890.) Pp. 64, 8vo, 1 mk.

Wynne, F. R. Plain Proofs of the Great Facts of Christianity, for the Help of Minds Perplexed with Difficulties. London: Hodder, 1890. 3d ed. Pp. 88, 12mo, 1s. 6d.

Źródlowski, Ferd., Prof., Dr. Theologische und politische Erwägungen. Zürich: 1890. Pp. 65, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

NOTICES OF MAGAZINES.

In Harper's for January, Charles Dudley Warner, in a paper of great practical value, describes "The Outlook in Southern California." Many illustrations of scenery and interesting objects in the fruit-growing regions of California accompany the paper. The very popular series of articles on South America is resumed by Mr. Child in this number, giving his "Impressions of Peru." This paper is also profusely illustrated. F. Anstey contributes an article on "London Music Halls," which is illustrated from a number of drawings by Joseph Pennell In "Another Chapter of My Memoirs," Mr. De Blowitz tells how he became a journalist, and relates some interesting reminiscences of the Franco-Prussian War and the days of the Paris Commune. The chief place in fiction is given to the opening chapters of Charles Egbert Craddock's new novel, "In the 'Stranger People's' Country," which is illustrated by W. T. Smedley. "At the 'Casa Napoléon'" is a story of life in the Spanish quarter of New York City, written by Thomas A. Janvier, and illustrated by Smedley. "A Modern Legend" is a beautiful short story by Vida D. Scudder. "Saint Anthony—a Christmas Eve Ballad," by Mrs. E. W. Latimer, is accompanied by three striking illustrations from drawings by C. S. Reinhart.

Littell's Living Age for 1891. This periodical has had a successful career of nearly fifty years, and it only improves as it grows older. A weekly magazine, it gives over three and a quarter thousand large and well-filled pages of reading matter—forming four large volumes—every year. Its frequent issue and ample space enable it to present with freshness and completeness the ablest essays, reviews and criticisms, the choicest serial and short stories, the most interesting sketches of travel and discovery, the best poetry, and the most valuable biographical, historical, scientific, and political information from the entire body of foreign periodical literature, and from the pens of the most eminent writers of the time.

The subscription price ($8 a year) is low for the amount of reading furnished. To any subscriber desiring to take more than one other periodical in connection with one copy of *The Living Age* the publishers will forward clubbing rates on application. Littell & Co., Boston, are the publishers.

Scribner's for January presents these articles: "The Pigmies of the Great African Forest," by Henry M. Stanley, (illustrated); "Japonica," second paper, Japanese People by Sir Edwin Arnold (illustrated); "A Truce," by Mary Tappan Wright (with an unpublished poem by Arthur Sherburne Hardy); "The Two Gates," by Margaret Vandegrift; "Modern Fire Apparatus," by John R. Spears (illustrated); "To Carmine," by I. D.; "Jerry," Part III., Chapters IV.–V. (begun in June, 1890—to be continued); "Botticelli's Madonna in the Louvre," by Edith Wharton; "Impressions of Australia," by Josiah Royce (illustrated); "The Rothenburg Festival-Play," by E. H. Lockwood (illustrated); "Court Tennis," by James Dwight, with illustrations; "Three Charades," by L. B. R. Briggs; "The Water Devil," a marine tale, by Frank R. Stockton (to be concluded in February); "The Architect's Point of View," by William P. P. Longfellow; "The Point of View:" The Philosophy of Flattery—Vanity in Authors—Artists as Critics.

The Century for January has these contents: "Portrait of Augustus Saint-Gaudens," from a painting by Kenyon Cox; "Along the Lower James," by Charles Washington Coleman (illustrated); "Kenyon Cox," by William A. Coffin (illustrated); "An Irish Gentlewoman in the Famine Time," by Octave Thanet; "The Two Spirits," by James B. Kenyon; "Among the Mongols of the Azure Lake," by W. Woodville Rockhill (illustrated); "The Memoirs of Talleyrand," (Introduction by the American Minister to France, Whitelaw Reid—A Strange Childhood—Talleyrand and Parisian Society—La Fayette—The American Revolution—The Duke of Orleans—Origin of the Revolution—Talleyrand in England—Talleyrand in America—Talleyrand and Hamilton), by, Talleyrand; "Pioneer Spanish Families in California," by Charles Howard Shinn (illustrated); "The Missions of Alta California," by John T. Doyle (illustrated); "A Romance of Morgan's Rough Riders": "The Raid," by Basil W. Duke; "The Capture," by Orlando B. Wilcox; "The Escape," by Thomas H. Hines (illustrated); "Colonel Carter of Cartersville," III. (begun in November), by F. Hopkinson Smith (illustrated); "Fireflies," by Charles Henry Lüders; "Sister Dolorosa," II. (begun in December), by James Lane Allen; "In Maiden Meditation," by George A. Hibbard; "Chinese Music," by H. E. Krehbiel (with music); "Nannie's Career," by Viola Roseboro'; "Heart Longing," by Constantina E. Brooke; "At the Town Farm," by Esther Bernon Carpenter. Californiana: "A Californian Lion and a Pirate," by Maria Antonio Castro; "A Carnival Ball at Monterey in 1829," by Brigida Briones; "A Spanish Girl's Journey from Monterey to Los Angeles," by Amelia Sibrian; "A Glimpse of Domestic Life in 1827," by Brigida Briones; "A Letter from General Sutter," by J. A. Sutter; and the departments Topics of the Time, Open Letters, and Bric-à-Brac.

THE
MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 3. FEBRUARY, 1891. No. 5.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF INFANT SALVATION.

BY PROFESSOR BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D.D., PRINCETON, N. J.

THE task which we set before us in this brief paper is not to unravel the history of opinion as to the salvation of infants dying in infancy, but the much more circumscribed one of tracing the development of doctrine on this subject. We hope to show that there has been a doctrine as to the salvation of infants common to all ages of the Church; but that there has also been in this, as in other doctrines, a progressive correction of crudities in its conception, by which the true meaning and relations of the common teaching have been freed from deforming accretions and its permanent core brought to purer expression.

1. It is fundamental to the very conception of Christianity that it is a remedial scheme. Christ Jesus came to save sinners. The first Christians had no difficulty in understanding and confessing that Christ had come into a world lost in sin to establish a kingdom of righteousness, citizenship in which is the condition of salvation. That infants were admitted into this citizenship they did not question; Irenæus, for example, finds it appropriate that Christ was born an infant and grew by natural stages into manhood, since "he came to save all by himself—all, I say, who by him are born again unto God, infants and children, and boys and young men, and old men," and accordingly passed through every age that he might sanctify all. Nor did they question that not the natural birth of the flesh, but the new birth of the Spirit was the sole gateway for infants too, into the kingdom; communion with God was lost for all alike, and to infants too it was restored only in Christ.[*] Less pure elements, however, entered almost inevitably into their thought. The ingrained externalism of both Jewish and heathen modes of conception, when brought into the Church wrought naturally toward the identification of the kingdom of Christ with the external Church, and of regeneration with baptism. Already in Justin and Irenæus, the word "regeneration" means "baptism;" the Fathers uniformly understand John iii. 5 of baptism. The maxim of the Patristic age thus became *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*; baptism was held to be necessary to salvation with the necessity of means; and as a corollary, no unbaptized infant could be saved. How early this doctrine of the necessity of baptism became settled in the Church is difficult to trace in the paucity of very early witnesses. Tertullian already defends it from objection.[*] The reply of Cyprian and his fellow-bishops to Fidus on the duty of early baptism, presupposes it.[†] After that, it was plainly the Church-doctrine; and although it was mitigated in the case of adults by the admission not only of the baptism of blood, but also that of intention,[‡] the latter mitigation was not allowed in the case of infants. The whole Patristic Church agreed that, martyrs excepted, no infant dying unbaptized could enter the kingdom of heaven.

The fairest exponent of the thought of the age on this subject is Augustine, who was called upon to defend it against the Pelagian error that infants dying unbaptized, while failing of entrance into the kingdom, yet obtain eternal life. His constancy in this controversy has won for him the unenviable title of *durus infantum pater*—a designation doubly unjust, in that not only did he neither originate the obnoxious dogma nor teach it in its harshest form, but he was even preparing its destruction by the doctrines of grace, of which he was more truly the father.[§] Augustine expressed the

---

[*] IRENÆUS, *Haer.*, ii., 22, 4, and iii., 18, 7.

[*] *De Bapt.*. c. 12.

[†] *Epistle* lviii. (lxiv.)

[‡] With what limitations may be conveniently read in WALL, *Hist. of Infant Baptism*, ed. 2, 1707, pp. 359 *sq.*

[§] Compare *The Post-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Dr. SCHAFF, vol. v. (*Augustin's Anti-Pelagian Treatises*), p. lxx.

Church-doctrine moderately, teaching, of course, that infants dying unbaptized would be found on Christ's left hand and be condemned to eternal punishment, but also not forgetting to add that their punishment would be the mildest of all, and indeed that they were to be beaten with so few stripes that he could not say it would have been better for them not to be born.[*] No doubt, others of the Fathers softened the doctrine even below this; some of the Greeks, for instance, like Gregory Nazianzen, thought that unbaptized infants "are neither glorified nor punished"—*i.e.*, of course, go into a middle state similar to that taught by Pelagius.[†] But it is not to Augustine, but to Fulgentius († 533),[‡] or to Alcimus Avitus († 525),[§] or to Gregory the Great († 604)[‖] to whom we must go for the strongest expression of the woe of unbaptized infants. Probably only such anonymous objectors as those whom Tertullian confutes,[¶] or such obscure and erratic individuals as Vincentius Victor whom Augustine convicts, in the whole Patristic age, doubted that the kingdom of heaven was closed to all infants departing this life without the sacrament of baptism.

2. If the general consent of a whole age as expressed by its chief writers, including the leading bishops of Rome, and its synodical decrees, is able to determine a doctrine, certainly the Patristic Church transmitted to the Middle Ages as *de fide* that infants dying unbaptized (with the exception only of those who suffer martyrdom) are not only excluded from heaven, but doomed to hell. Accordingly the mediæval synods so define; the second Council of Lyons and the Council of Florence declare that "the souls of those who pass away in mortal sin or in original sin alone descend immediately to hell, to be punished, however, with unequal penalties." On the maxim that *gradus non mutant speciem* we must adjudge Petavius's argument[**] unanswerable, that this deliverance determines the punishment of unbaptized infants to be the same in kind (in the same hell) with that of adults in mortal sin: "So infants are tormented with unequal tortures of fire, but are tormented nevertheless." Nevertheless scholastic thought on the subject was characterized by a successful effort to mollify the harshness of the Church doctrine, under the impulse of the prevalent semi-Pelagian conception of original sin. The whole troup of schoolmen unite in distinguishing between *pœna damni* and *pœna sensus*, and in assigning to infants dying unbaptized only the former—*i.e.*, the loss of heaven and the beatific vision, and not the latter—*i.e.*, positive torment. They differ among themselves only as to whether this *pœna damni*, which alone is the lot of infants, is accompanied by a painful sense of the loss (as Lombard held), or is so negative as to involve no pain at all, either external or internal (as Aquinas argued). So complete a victory was won by this mollification that perhaps only a single theologian of eminence can be pointed to who ventured still to teach the doctrine of Augustine and Gregory—Gregory Ariminensis thence called *tortor infantum;* and Hurter reminds us that even he did not dare to teach it definitively, but submitted it to the judgment of his readers.[*] Dante, whom Andrew Seth not unjustly calls "by far the greatest disciple of Aquinas," has enshrined in his immortal poem the leading conception of his day, when he pictures the "young children innocent, whom Death's sharp teeth have snatched ere yet they were freed from the sin with which our birth is blent," as imprisoned within the brink of hell, "where the first circle girds the abyss of dread," in a place where "there is no sharp agony" but "dark shadows only," and whence "no other plaint rises than that of sighs which from the sorrow without pain arise."[†] The novel doctrine attained papal authority by a decree of Innocent III. (c. 1200), who determined "the penalty of original sin to be the lack of the vision of God, but the penalty of actual sin to be the torments of eternal hell."

A more timid effort was also made in this period to modify the inherited doctrine by the application to it of a development of the baptism of intention. This tendency first appears in Hincmar of Rheims († 882), who, in a particularly hard case of interdict on a whole diocese, expresses the hope that "the faith and godly desire of the parents and godfathers" of the infants who had thus died unbaptized, "who in sincerity desired baptism for them but obtained it not, may profit them by the gift of Him whose spirit (which gives regeneration) breathes where it pleaseth." It is doubtful, however, whether he would have extended this lofty doctrine to any less stringent case.[*] Certainly no similar teaching is met with in the Church, except with reference to the peculiarly hard case of still-born infants of Christian parents. The schoolmen (*e.g.*, Alexander Hales and Thomas Aquinas) admitted a doubt whether God may not have ways of saving such unknown to us. John Gerson, in a sermon before the Council of Constance, presses the inference more boldly.[†] God, he declared, has not so tied the mercy of his salvation to common laws and sacraments, but that without prejudice to his law he can sanctify children not yet born, by the baptism of his grace or the power of the Holy Ghost. Hence, he exhorts expectant parents to pray that if the infant is to die before attaining baptism, the Lord may sanctify it ; and who knows but that the Lord may hear them ? He adds, however, that he only intends to suggest that all hope is not taken away, for there is no certainty without a revelation. Gabriel Biel († 1495) followed in Gerson's footsteps,[‡] holding it to be accordant with God's mercy to seek out some remedy for such infants. This teaching remained, however, without effect on the Church-dogma, although something similar to it was, among men who served God in the way then called heresy, foreshadowing an even better to come. John Wycliffe († 1384) had already with like caution expressed his unwillingness to pronounce such infants as were intended for baptism by their parents damned, if they failed to receive it in fact ; though he could not, on the other hand, assert that they were saved.[§] His followers were less cautious, whether in England or Bohemia, and in this, too, approved themselves heralds of a brighter day.

---

[*] Augustine's doctrine is most strongly expressed in *Sermo xiv.* In *De Peccat. Merit.*, c. 21 (xvi.), and *Contra Julian.*, v., 11, he speaks of the comparative mildness of the punishment.

[†] Cf. WALL, *op. cit.*, p. 365.

[‡] *De Fide ad Petr.*, c. 27.

[§] *Ad Fascinam Sororem.*

[‖] *Expos. in Job.*, i., 16.

[¶] *De Bapt.*, c. 12.

[**] PETAVIUS, *Dog. Theol.*, ed. Paris, 1865, ii., 59 *sq.*

[*] HURTER, *Theolog. Dogmat. Compend.*, 1878, iii., p. 516. Tract. x., cap. iii., § 729. Wycliffe must be added.

[†] *Hell*, iv., 23 *sq.*; *Purgatory*, vii., 25 *sq.*; *Heaven*, xxxii., 76 *sq.* (Plumptre's translation).

3. In the upheaval of the sixteenth century the Church of Rome found her task in harmonizing under the influence of the scholastic teaching, the inheritance which the somewhat inconsistent past had bequeathed her. Four varieties of opinion sought a place in her teaching. At the one extreme the earlier doctrine of Augustine and Gregory, that infants dying unbaptized suffer eternally the pains of sense, found again advocates, and that especially among the greatest of her scholars, such as Noris, Petau, Driedo, Conry, Berti. At the other extreme, a Pelagianizing doctrine that excluded unbaptized infants from the kingdom of heaven and the life promised to the blessed, and yet accorded to them eternal life and natural happiness in a place between heaven and hell, was advocated by such great leaders as Ambrosius Catharinus, Albertus Pighius, Molina, Sfondrati. The mass, however, followed the schoolmen in the middle path of *pœna damni*, and, like the schoolmen, only differed as to whether the punishment of loss involved sorrow (as Bellarmine held) or was purely negative.[*] The Council of Trent (1545) anathematized those who affirm that the " sacraments of the new law are not necessary to salvation, and that without them or an intention of them men obtain . . . the grace of justification ;" or, again, that " baptism is free—that is, is not necessary to salvation." This is explained by the Tridentine Catechism to mean that " unless men be regenerated to God through the grace of baptism, they are born to everlasting misery and destruction, whether their parents be believers or unbelievers ;" while, on the other hand, we are credibly informed [†] that the council was near anathematizing as a Lutheran heresy the proposition that the penalty for original sin is the fire of hell. The Council of Trent at least made renewedly *de fide* that infants dying unbaptized incurred damnation, though it left the way open for discussion as to the kind and amount of their punishment.[‡]

The Tridentine deliverance, of course, does not exclude the baptism of blood as a substitute for baptism of water. Neither does it seem necessarily to exclude the application of a theory of baptism of intention to infants. Even after it, therefore, a twofold development seems to have been possible. The path already opened by Gerson and Biel might have been followed out, and a baptism of intention developed for infants as well as for adults. This might even have been pushed on logically, so as to cover the case of all infants dying in infancy. On the principle argued by Richard Hooker,[§] for example, that the unavoidable failure of baptism in the case of Christian children cannot lose them salvation, because of the presumed desire and purpose of baptism for them in their Christian parents and in the Church of God, reasoners might have proceeded only a single step further and have said that the desire and purpose of Mother Church to baptize all is intention of baptism enough for all dying in helpless infancy. Thus on Roman principles a salvation for all dying in infancy might be logically deduced, and infants, as more helpless and less guilty, be given the preference over adults. On the other hand, it might be argued that as baptism either *in re* or *in voto* must mediate salvation, and as infants by reason of their age are incapable of the intention, they cannot be saved unless they receive it in fact,[*] and thus infants be discriminated against in favor of adults. This second path is the one which has been actually followed by the theologians of the Church of Rome, with the ultimate result that not only are infants discriminated against in favor of adults, but the more recent theologians seem almost ready to discriminate against the infants of Christians as over against those of the heathen.[†]

---

[*] Cf. WALL, *op. cit.*, p. 371.

[†] *Sermon, De Nat. Mar. Virg.*, consid. 2, col. 33.

[‡] In iv., Sect. iv., q. 11.

[§] Cf. WALL, as above.

[*] For this classification see BELLARMINE, *De Amiss. Gratiæ*, etc., vi., 1 ; and compare GERHARD, *Loci* (Cotta's ed.), vol. ix., p. 279 ; CHAMIER, *Panstrat. Cath.* (1626), iii., 159, or SPANHEIM, *Chamierus Contractus* (1643), p. 797.

[†] So Father PAUL, *Hist. of the Council of Trent*, c. 2.

[‡] PERRONE, *Prælect. Theol. in Compend. Redact.*, i., p. 494.

[§] *Ecclesiastical Polity*, v., ix., 6.

The application of the baptism of intention to infants was not abandoned, however, without some protest from the more tender-hearted. Cardinal Cajetan defended in the Council of Trent itself Gerson's proposition that the desire of godly parents might be taken in lieu of the actual baptism of children dying in the womb.[‡] Cassander (1570) encouraged parents to hope and pray for children so dying.[§] Bianchi (1768) holds that such children may be saved *per oblationem pueri quam Deo mater extrinsecus faciat.*[‖] Eusebius Amort (1758) teaches that God may be moved by prayer to grant justification to such extra-sacramentally.[¶] Even somewhat bizarre efforts have been made to escape the sad conclusion proclaimed by the Church. Thus Klee holds that a lucid interval is accorded to infants in the article of death, so that they may conceive the wish for baptism.[*] An obscure French writer supposes that they may, " shut up in their mother's womb, know God, love him, and have the baptism of desire."[†] A more obscure German conceives that infants remain eternally in the same state of rational development in which they die, and hence enjoy all they are capable of ; if they die in the womb they either fall back into the original force from which they were produced, or enjoy a happiness no greater than that of trees.[‡] These protests of the heart have awakened, however, no response in the Church,[§] which has preferred to hold fast to the dogma that the failure of baptism in infants, dying such, excludes *ipso facto* from heaven, and to seek its comfort in mitigating still farther than the scholastics themselves the nature of that *pœna damni* which alone it allows as punishment of original sin.

And if we may assume that such writers as Perrone, Hurter, Gousset, and Kendrick are typical of modern Roman theology throughout the world, certainly that theology may be said to have come, in this pathway of mitigation, as near to positing salvation for all infants dying unbaptized as the rather intractable deliverances of early popes and later councils permit to them. They all teach, of course (as the definitions of Florence and Trent require of them)—in the words of Perrone[‖]—" that children of this kind descend into hell, or incur damnation ;" but (as Hurter says[¶]), " although all Catholics agree that infants dying without baptism are excluded from the beatific vision and so suffer *loss*, are *lost* (*pati damnum, damnari*) ; they yet differ among themselves in their determination of the nature and condition of the state into which such infants pass." As the idea of " damnation" may thus be softened to a mere *failure to attain*, so the idea of " hell " may be elevated to that of a natural *paradise*. Hurter himself is inclined to a somewhat severer doctrine ; but Perrone (supported by such great lights as Balmes, Berlage, Oswald, Lessius, and followed not afar off by Gousset and Kendrick) reverts to the Pelagianizing view of Catharinus and Molina and Sfondrati, which Petau called a " fabrication" championed indeed by Catharinus but originated " by Pelagius the heretic," and which Bellarmine contended was *contra fidem*—and teaches that unbaptized infants enter into a state deprived of all supernatural benefits, indeed, but endowed with all the happiness of which pure nature is capable. Their state is described as having the nature of penalty and of damnation when conceived of relatively to the supernatural happiness from which they are excluded by original sin; but when conceived of in itself and absolutely, it is a state of pure nature, and accordingly the words of Thomas Aquinas are applied to it: "They are joined to God by participation in natural goods, and so also can rejoice in natural knowledge and love." * Thus, after so many ages, the Pelagian conception of the middle state for infants has obtained its revenge on the condemnation of the Church. No doubt it is not admitted that this is a return to Pelagianism; Perrone, for example, argues that Pelagius held the doctrine of a natural beatitude for infants as one unrelated to sin, while "Catholic theologians hold it with the death of sin; so that the exclusion from the beatific vision has the nature of penalty and of damnation proceeding from sin." † Is there more than a verbal difference here? At all events, whatever difference exists is a difference not in the doctrine of the state of unbaptized infants after death, but in the doctrine of the fall. In deference to the language of fathers and councils and popes, this natural paradise is formally assigned to that portion of the other world designated "hell," but in its own nature it is precisely the Pelagian doctrine of the state of unbaptized infants after death. By what expedient such teaching is to be reconciled with the other doctrines of the Church of Rome, or with its former teaching on this same subject, or with its boast of *semper eadem*, is more interesting to its advocates within that communion than to us.‡ Our interest as historians of opinion is exhausted in simply noting the fact that the Pelagianizing process, begun in the Middle Ages by assigning to infants guilty only of original sin liability to *pœna damni* alone, culminates in our day in their assignment by the most representative theologians of modern Rome to a natural paradise.

---

[*] Thus, *e.g.*, Dominicus de Soto expresses it (*De Natura et Gratia*, ii. 10) : " It is most firmly established in the Church that no infant apart from baptism *in re*—since he cannot have it *in voto*—enters the kingdom of heaven."

[†] This grows out of the development of the doctrines of ignorance and " invincible ignorance," the latter of which was authoritatively defined by Pope Pius IX. in his Encyclical addressed to the Bishops of Italy. August 10, 1863. See an interesting statement concerning it in Newman's *A Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, on the Infallibility of the Pope. Thus while an absolute necessity for baptism *in re* is posited for the infants of even Christian parents, even though they die in the womb, on the other hand, as the law of baptism is in force only where it is known, and even an ignorance morally invincible (as among sectaries) is counted true ignorance. not even an intention of baptism is demanded of the heathen or of certain sectaries. Gousset, *Théolog. Dogmat.*, 10 ed., Paris, 1866, i., 548, 549, 351, ii., 382, may be profitably consulted in this connection. Among the heathen thus the old remedies for sin are still probably valid ; St. Bernard says (quoted approvingly by Gousset), "Among the Gentiles as many as are found faithful, we believe that the adults are expiated by faith and the sacrifices , but the faith of the parents profits the children, nay, even suffices for them." If the fathers are saved, why not the children ? Might not a Christian's infant dying in the womb be said to be " invincibly ignorant " ? Why need the " law of baptism " be so inflexibly extended to *it* ?

[‡] In 3 Part. Thomæ. Q. 68, art. 2, et 11.

[§] *De bapt. infant.*

[‖] *De Remedio . . . pro parentis.*

[¶] *Theolog. Moral.*, ii., xi., 3.

[*] *Dog.* iii., 2, § 1.

[†] De la Marne, *Traité metaphysique des Dogmes de la Trinité*, etc., Paris, 1826.

[‡] Hermessius, *Zeitschr. f. Phil. u. kath. Theol.*, Bonn.. 1832.

[§] Compare Vasquez, in 3 P. s. Th., disp. cli., cap. 1 ; Hurter, *op. cit.*, 1878, iii., 516 *sq.* ; Perrone, *Prælect. Theolog.* (1839), vi. 55.

[‖] *Compend.* 1861, i., 494, No. 585.

[¶] *Op. cit.*, No. 729.

4. It is, no doubt, as a protest against the harshness of the Romanist syllogism, "No man can attain salvation who is not a member of Christ; but no one becomes a member of Christ except by baptism, received either *in re* or *in voto*,"§ that this Pelagianizing drift is to be regarded. Its fault is that it impinges by way of mitigation and modification on the *major* premise, which, however, is the fundamental proposition of Christianity. Its roots are planted, in the last analysis, in a conception of men, not as fallen creatures, children of wrath, and deserving of a doom which can only be escaped by becoming members of Christ, but as creatures of God with claims on him for natural happiness, but, of course, with no claims on him for such additional supernatural benefits as he may yet lovingly confer on his creatures in Christ. On the other hand, that great religious movement which we call the Reformation, the constitutive principle of which was its revised doctrine of the Church, ranged itself properly against the fallacious *minor* premise, and easily broke its bonds with the sword of the word. Men are not constituted members of Christ through the Church, but members of the Church through Christ; they are not made the members of Christ by baptism which the Church gives, but by faith, the gift of God; and baptism is the Church's recognition of this inner fact. The full benefit of this better apprehension of the nature of that Church of God, membership in which is the condition of salvation, was not reaped, however, by all Protestants in equal measure. It was the strength of the Lutheran movement that it worked out its positions not theoretically or all at once, but step by step, as it was forced on by the logic of events and experience. But it was an incidental evil that, being compelled to express its faith early, its first confession was framed before the full development of Protestant thought, and subsequently contracted the faith of Lutheranism into too narrow channels. The Augsburg Confession contains the true doctrine of the Church as the *congregatio sanctorum;* but it committed Lutheranism to the doctrine that baptism is necessary to salvation (Art. IX.) in such a sense that children are not saved without baptism (Art. IX.),* inasmuch as the condemnation and eternal death brought by original sin upon all are not removed except from those who are born again by baptism and the Holy Ghost (Art. II.)—*i.e.*, to the doctrine that the necessity of baptism is the necessity of means. In the direction of mollifying interpretation of this deliverance, the theologians urge: 1. That the necessity affirmed is not absolute but ordinary, and binds man and not God. 2. That as the assertion is directed against the Anabaptists,

---

* *Compend*, 1861, i., 494, cf. ii., 252. † *Ibid.*, l.c., No. 590.

‡ See some of the difficulties very mildly stated in HURTER, *loc. cit.*

§ The words are AQUINAS's (p. 3. q. 68, art. 1); see them quoted and applied by PERRONE, *Compend.*, ii., 253.

* "Or outside the Church of Christ," as is added in ed. 1540.

it is not the privation, but the contempt of baptism that is affirmed to be damning. 3. That the necessity of baptism is not intended to be equalized with that of the Holy Ghost. 4. That the affirmation is not that for original sin alone any one is actually damned, but only that all are therefor damnable. There is force in these considerations. But they do not avail wholly to relieve the Augsburg Confession of limiting salvation to those who enjoy the means of grace, and as concerns infants, to those who receive the sacrament of baptism.

It is not to be held, of course, that it asserts such an absolute necessity of baptism for infants dying such, as admits no exceptions. From Luther and Melanchthon down, Lutheran theologians have always taught what Hunnius expressed in the Saxon Visitation Articles : "Unless a person be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. *Cases of necessity are not intended, however, by this.*" Lutheran theology, in other words, takes its stand positively on the ground of baptism of intention as applied to infants, as over against its denial by the Church of Rome. "Luther," says Dorner,[*] "holds fast, in general, to the necessity of baptism in order to salvation, but in reference to the children of Christians who have died unbaptized, he says : 'The Holy and Merciful God will think kindly of them. What he will do with them he has revealed to no one, that baptism may not be despised, but has reserved to his own mercy ; God does wrong to no man.'"[†] From the fact that Jewish children dying before circumcision were not lost, Luther argues that neither are Christian children dying before baptism ;[‡] and he comforts Christian mothers of still-born babes by declaring that they should understand that such infants are saved.[§] So Bugenhagen, under Luther's direction, teaches that Christians' children intended for baptism are not left to the hidden judgment of God if they fail of baptism, but have the promise of being received by Christ into his kingdom.[‖] It is not necessary to quote later authors on a point on which all are unanimous ; let it suffice to add only the clear statement of the developed Lutheranism of John Gerhard (1610–22) :[¶] "We walk in the middle way, teaching that baptism is, indeed, the ordinary sacrament of initiation and means of regeneration necessary to all, even to the children of believers, for regeneration and salvation ; but yet that in the event of privation or impossibility the children of Christians are saved by an extraordinary and peculiar divine dispensation. For the necessity of baptism is not absolute, but ordinary ; we on our part are obliged to the necessity of baptism, but there must be no denial of the extraordinary action of God in infants offered to Christ by pious parents and the Church in prayers, and dying before the opportunity of baptism can be given them, since God does not so bind his grace and saving efficacy to baptism as that, in the event of privation, he may not both wish and be able to act extraordinarily. We distinguish, then, between necessity on *God's* part and on *our* part ; between the case of *privation* and the *ordinary* way ; and also between infants born *in* the Church and *out* of the Church. Concerning infants born out of the Church, we say with the apostle (1 Cor. v. 12, 13), 'For what have I to do with judging them that are without ? Do not you judge them that are within ? For them that are without God judgeth.' Wherefore, since there is no promise concerning them, we commit them to God's judgment ; and yet we hold to no place intermediate between heaven and hell, concerning which there is utter silence in Scripture. But concerning infants born in the Church we have better hope. Pious parents properly bring their children as soon as possibe to baptism as the ordinary means of regeneration, and offer them in baptism to Christ ; and those who are negligent in this, so as through lack of care or wicked contempt for the sacrament to deprive their children of baptism, shall hereafter render a very heavy account to God, since they have 'despised the counsel of God' (Luke vii. 30). Yet neither can nor ought we rashly to condemn those infants which die in their mothers' wombs or by some sudden accident before they receive baptism, but may rather hold that the prayers of pious parents, or, if the parents are negligent of this, the prayers of the Church, poured out for these infants, are clemently heard and they are received by God into grace and life."

From this passage, too, we may learn the historical attitude of Lutheranism toward the entirely different question of the fate of infants dying outside the pale of the Church and the reach of its ordinances, a multitude so vast that it is wholly unreasonable to suppose them simply (like Christians' children deprived of baptism) exceptions to the rule laid down in the Augsburg Confession. It is perfectly clear that the Lutheran Confessions extend no hope for them. It is doubtful whether it can even be said that they leave room for hope for them. Melanchthon in the *Apology* is no doubt arguing against the Anabaptists, and intends to prove only that children should be baptized; but his words in explanation of Art. IX. deserve consideration in this connection also—where he argues that "the promise of salvation" "does not pertain to those who are without the Church of Christ, where there is neither the Word nor the Sacraments, because the kingdom of Christ exists only with the Word and the Sacraments." Luther's personal opinion as to the fate of heathen children dying in infancy is in doubt; now he expresses the hope that the good and gracious God may have something good in view for them;[*] and again, though leaving it to the future to decide, he only expects something milder for them than for the adults outside the Church;[†] and Bugenhagen, under his eye, contrasts the children of Turks and Jews with those of Christians, as not sharers in salvation because not in Christ.[‡] From the very first the opinion of the theologians was divided on the subject. (1) Some held that all infants except those baptized in fact or intention are lost, and ascribed to them, of course—for this was the Protestant view of the desert of original sin—both privative and positive punishment. This party included such theologians as Quistorpius, Calovius, Fechter, Zeibichius, Buddeus. (2) Others judged that we may cherish the best of hope for their salvation. Here belong Dannhauer, Hulsemann, Scherzer, J. A. Osiander, Wagner, Musæus, Cotta, and Spener. But the great body of Lutherans, including such names as Gerhard, Calixtus, Meisner, Baldwin, Bechmann, Hoffmann, Hunnius, held that nothing is clearly revealed as to the fate of such infants, and they must be left to the judgment of God. (3) Some of these, like Hunnius, were inclined to believe that they will be saved. (4) Others, with more (like Hoffmann) or less (like Gerhard) clearness, were rather inclined to believe they will be lost; but all alike held that the means for a certain decision are not in our hands.[§] Thus Hunnius says:[‖] "That the infants of Gentiles, outside the Church, are saved, we cannot pronounce as certain, since there exists nothing definite in the Scriptures concerning the matter; so neither do I dare simply to assert that these children are indiscriminately damned. . . . Let us commit them, therefore, to the judgment of God." And Hoffmann says:[*] "On the question, whether the infants of the heathen nations are lost, most of our theologians prefer to suspend their judgment. To affirm as a certain thing that they are lost could not be done without rashness."

---

[*] *Hist. of Protestant Theology* (E.T.), i., 171.

[†] *Opp.*, xxii., 872 (Dorner's quotation).

[‡] *Com. in Gen.*, c. 17.

[§] *Christliche Bedenken.*

[‖] See for several such quotations brought together, LAURENCE, *Bampton Lectures*, 1804, ed. 1820, p. 272. Also GERHARD as in next note.

[¶] Ed. Cotta, vol. ix., p. 284.

This cautious agnostic attitude has the best right to be called the historical Lutheran attitude. It is even the highest position thoroughly consistent with the genius of the Lutheran system and the stress which it lays on the means of grace. The drift in more modern times has, however, been decidedly in the direction of affirming the salvation of all that die in infancy, on grounds identical with those pleaded by this party from the beginning—the infinite mercy of God, the universality of the atonement, the inability of infants to resist grace, their guiltlessness of despising the ordinance, and the like.[†] Even so, however, careful modern Lutherans moderate their assertions. They may affirm that "it is not the doctrine of our Confession that any human creature has ever been or ever will be lost purely for original sin;"[‡] but they speak of the matter as a "dark" or a "difficult question,"[§] and suspend the salvation of such infants on an "extraordinary" and "uncovenanted" exercise of God's mercy.[‖] We cannot rise to a conviction or a "faith" in the matter, but may attain to a "well-grounded hope," based on our apprehension of God's all-embracing mercy.[¶] In short, the Lutheran doctrine seems to lay no firm foundation for a conviction of the salvation of all infants dying in infancy; at the best it is held to leave open an uncontradicted hope. We are afraid we must say more; it seems to contradict this hope. For should this hope prove true, it would no longer be true that "baptism is necessary to salvation," even *ordinarily*; the exception would be the rule. Nor would the fundamental conception of the Lutheran theory of salvation—that grace is in the means of grace—be longer tenable. The logic of the Lutheran system leaves little room for the salvation of all infants dying in infancy, and if their salvation should prove to be a fact, the integrity of the system is endangered.

5. A similar difficulty is experienced by

---

[*] Cf. DORNER, *Hist. Prot. Theol.*, i., 171.

[†] Cf. LAURENCE, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 272.

[‡] *Ibid.*

[§] This classification is taken from COTTA (Gerhard's *Loci*, ix., 282).

[‖] *Quæst. in cap. vii. Gen.*

[*] See KRAUTH, *Conservative Reformation*, p. 433.

[†] Compare the statements in COTTA and KRAUTH, *locc. citt.*

[‡] KRAUTH, *l.c.*, p. 429.

[§] *Ib.*, pp. 561–63.

[‖] *Ib.*, pp. 430, 437.

[¶] KRAUTH, *Infant Salvation in the Calvinistic System*, p. 22.

all types of Protestant thought in which the older idea of the Church, as primarily an external body, has been incompletely reformed. This may be illustrated, for example, from the history of thought in the Church of England. The Thirty-nine Articles, in their final form, are thoroughly Protestant and Reformed. And many of the greatest English theologians, even among those not most closely affiliated with Geneva, from the very earliest days of the Reformation, have repudiated the "cruel judgment" of the Church of Rome as to the fate of infants dying unbaptized. But this repudiation was neither immediate, nor has it ever been universal. The second of the Ten Articles of Henry VIII. (1536) not only declares that the promise of grace and eternal life is adjoined to baptism, but adds that infants "by the sacrament of baptism do also obtain remission of their sins, the grace and favor of God, and be made thereby the very sons and children of God; insomuch as infants and children dying in their infancy shall undoubtedly be saved thereby, and else not." The first liturgy embodied the same implication. The growing Protestant sentiment soon revised it out of these standards.* But there have never lacked those in the Church of England who still taught the necessity of baptism to salvation. If it can boast of a John Hooper, who speaks of "the ungodly opinion that attributeth the salvation of men unto the receiving of an external sacrament," "as though the Holy Spirit could not be carried by faith into the penitent and sorrowful conscience except it rid always in a chariot and external sacrament," and who (probably first after Zwingli) taught that all infants dying in infancy, whether children of Christians or infidels, are saved;† it also has counted among its teachers many who held with Matthew Scrivener that Christ's "death and passion are not communicated unto any but by outward signs and sacraments," so that "either all children must be damned, being unbaptized, or they must have baptism." ‡ The general position of the Church up to his day is thus conceived by Wall:§ "The Church of England have declared their sense of its [*i.e.*, baptism's] necessity by reciting the saying of our Saviour, John iii. 5, both in the Office of Baptism of Infants and also in that for those of riper years. . . . Concerning the everlasting state of an infant that by misfortune dies unbaptized, the Church of England has determined nothing (it were fit that all churches would leave such things to God) save that they forbid the ordinary *Office for Burial* to be used for such an one; for that were to determine the point and acknowledge him for a Christian brother. And tho' the most noted men in the said Church from time to time since the Reformation of it to this time have expressed their hopes that God will accept the purpose of the parent for the deed; yet they have done it modestly and much as Wycliffe did, rather not determining the negative than absolutely determining the positive, that such a child shall enter into the kingdom of heaven." If this is all that can be said of the children of the faithful, lacking baptism, where will those of the infidel appear? Many other opinions—more Protestant or more Pelagian—have, of course, found a home for themselves in the bosom of this most inclusive cummunion, but they are no more characteristic of its teaching than that of Wall. It is only needful to remember that there are still many among the clergy of the Church of England who, retaining the old, unreformed view of the Church, still believe "that the relationship of sonship to God is imparted through baptism and is not imparted without it;" * though, of course, many others, and we hope still a large majority, would repudiate this position as incredible.

6. It was among the Reformed alone that the newly recovered scriptural apprehension of the Church to which the promises were given, as essentially not an externally organized body but the people of God, membership in which is mediated not by the external act of baptism but by the internal regeneration of the Holy Spirit, bore its full fruit in rectifying the doctrine of the application of redemption. This great truth was taught alike by both branches of Protestantism, but it was limited in its application in the one line of teaching by a very high doctrine of the means of grace, while in the other it became itself constitutive of the doctrine of the means of grace. Not a few Reformed theologians, even outside the Church of England, no doubt also held a high doctrine of the means; of whom Peter Jurieu may be taken as a type.† But this was not characteristic of the Reformed churches, the distinguishing doctrine of which rather by suspending salvation on membership in the invisible instead of in

---

* For an outline of the history see SCHAFF, *Creeds of Christendom*, i., 642; cf. LAURENCE, *op. cit.*, p. 176 *sq.*

† *An Answer to My Lord of Winchester's Book*, etc., 1547, in Parker Society's *Early Writings of Bishop Hooper*, pp. 129, 131.

‡ *Course of Divinity*, London, 1674, p. 196.

§ *Hist. of Infant Baptism*, ed. 2, 1707, p. 377.

* *Oxford Tracts*, vol. ii., No. 66.

† See his views quoted and discussed by WITSIUS, *De Efficace et Utilitate Bapt.* in *Miscel. Sacra* (1636), ii., 513.

the visible Church, transformed baptism from a necessity into a duty, and left men dependent for salvation on nothing but the infinite love and free grace of God. In this view the absolutely free and loving election of God alone is determinative of the saved; so that how many and who they are is known absolutely to God alone, and to us only so far forth as it may be inferred from the marks and signs of election revealed to us in the Word. Faith and its fruits are the chief signs in the case of adults, and he that believes may know that he is of the elect. In the case of infants dying in infancy, birth within the bounds of the covenant is a sure sign, since the promise is "unto us and our children." But present unbelief is not a sure sign of reprobation in the case of adults, for who knows but that unbelief may yet give place to faith? Nor in the case of infants, dying such, is birth outside the covenant a trustworthy sign of reprobation, for the election of God is free. Accordingly there are many—adults and infants—of whose salvation we may be sure, but of reprobation we cannot be sure; such a judgment is necessarily unsafe even as to adults apparently living in sin, while as to infants who "die and give no sign," it is presumptuous and rash in the extreme.

The above is practically an outline of the teaching of Zwingli. He himself worked it out in its logical completeness, and taught: 1. That all believers are elect and hence are saved, though we cannot know infallibly who are true believers except in our own case. 2. All children of believers dying in infancy are elect and hence are saved, for this rests on God's immutable promise. 3. It is probable, from the superabundance of the gift of grace over the offence, that all infants dying such are elect and saved; so that death in infancy is a sign of election; and although this must be left with God, it is certainly rash and even impious to affirm their damnation. 4. All who are saved, whether adult or infant, are saved only by the free grace of God's election and through the redemption of Christ.* But the central principle of Zwingli's teaching is not only the common possession of all Calvinists, but the essential postulate of their system. They can differ among themselves only in their determination of what the signs of election and reprobation are, and in their interpretation of these signs. On these grounds Calvinists early divided into five classes: 1. From the beginning a few held with Zwingli that death in infancy is a sign of election, and hence that all who die in infancy are the children of God and enter at once into glory. After Zwingli, Bishop Hooper was probably the first* to embrace this view.† It has more lately become the ruling view, and we may select Augustus Toplady‡ and Robert S. Candlish as its types. The latter, for example, writes:§ "In many ways I apprehend it may be inferred from Scripture that all dying in infancy are elect, and are, therefore, saved. . . . The whole analogy of the plan of saving mercy seems to favor the same view, and now it may be seen, if I am not greatly mistaken, to be put beyond question by the bare fact that little children die. . . . The death of little children must be held to be one of the fruits of redemption. . . ." 2. At the opposite extreme a very few held that the only sure sign of election is faith with its fruits, and, therefore, we can have no real ground of knowledge concerning the fate of any infant; as, however, God certainly has his elect among them too, each man can cherish the hope that his children are of the elect. Peter Martyr approaches this sadly agnostic position (which was afterward condemned by the Synod of Dort), writing: "Neither am I to be thought to promise salvation to all the children of the faithful which depart without the sacrament, for if I should do so I might be counted rash; I leave them to be judged by the mercy of God, seeing I have no certainty concerning the secret election and predestination; but I only assert that those are truly saved to whom the divine election extends, although baptism does not intervene. Just so, I hope well concerning infants of this kind, because I see them born from faithful parents; and this thing has promises that are uncommon; and although they may not be general, *quoad omnes*, yet when I see nothing to the contrary it is right to hope well concerning the salvation of such infants."‖ The great body of Calvinists, however, previous to the present century,

---

[*] Zwingli's teaching may be conveniently worked out by the aid of AUGUST BAUR's valuable *Zwinglis Theologie*, especially vol. ii. (Halle, 1889). Zwingli's doctrine of original sin had practically no influence on this question.

[*] The adverb is used advisedly. CALVIN is often held to have believed that all infants dying such are saved. For a careful statement of this opinion see especially the full and learned paper of DR. CHARLES W. SHIELDS, in *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for October, 1890 (vol i., pp. 634–651). To us, however, Calvin seems, while speaking with admirable caution, to imply that he believed some infants dying such to be lost. See, *e.g.*, his comment on Rom. v. 17, and his treatises against Pighins, Servetus, and Castellio. DR. SCHAFF repeatedly speaks of BULLINGER as agreeing in this point with Zwingli—on what grounds we know not unless the note in *Creeds of Christendom*, i., 642, note 3, is intended to direct us to the passages quoted by Laurence as such. But these passages do not seem to support that opinion; and in a diligent search in Bullinger's works we find nothing to favor it and much to negative it.

[†] See reference *ante*, p. 129.

[‡] *The Works of*, etc., new ed., 1837, p. 645.

[§] *The Atonement*, etc., 1861, pp. 183, 184.

[‖] *Loci Communes*, i., class 4, cap 5, § 16 (compare iv., 100).

took their position between these extremes. 3. Many held that faith and the promise are sure signs of election, and accordingly all believers and their children are certainly saved ; but that the lack of faith and the promise is an equally sure sign of reprobation, so that all the children of unbelievers, dying such, are equally certainly lost. The younger Spanheim, for example, writes : "Confessedly, therefore, original sin is a most just cause of positive reprobation. Hence no one fails to see what we should think concerning the children of pagans dying in their childhood ; for unless we acknowledge salvation outside of God's covenant and Church (like the Pelagians of old, and with them Tertullian, Epiphanius, Clement of Alexandria, of the ancients, and of the moderns, Andradius, Ludovicus Vives, Erasmus, and not a few others, against the whole Bible), and suppose that all the children of the heathen, dying in infancy, are saved, and that it would be a great blessing to them if they should be smothered by the midwives or strangled in the cradle, we should humbly believe that they are justly reprobated by God on account of the corruption (*labes*) and guilt (*reatus*) derived to them by natural propagation. Hence, too, Paul testifies (Rom. v. 14) that death has passed upon them which have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, and distinguishes and separates (1 Cor. vii. 14) the children of the covenanted as holy from the impure children of unbelievers." [*] 4. More held that faith and the promise are certain signs of election, so that the salvation of believers' children is certain, while the lack of the promise only leaves us in ignorance of God's purpose ; nevertheless that there is good ground for asserting that both election and reprobation have place in this unknown sphere. Accordingly they held that all the infants of believers, dying such, are saved, but that some of the infants of unbelievers, dying such, are lost. Probably no higher expression of this general view can be found than John Owen's. He argues that there are two ways in which God saves infants : "(1) by interesting them in the covenant, if their immediate or remote parents have been believers. He is a God of them and of their seed, extending his mercy to a thousand generations of them that fear him ;[†] (2) by his grace of election, which is most free and not tied to any conditions, by which I make no doubt but God taketh many unto him in Christ whose parents never knew or had been despisers of the Gospel." [*] 5. Most Calvinists of the past, however, have simply held that faith and the promise are marks by which we may know assuredly that all those who believe and their children, dying such, are elect and saved, while the absence of sure marks of either election or reprobation in infants, dying such outside the covenant, leaves us without ground for inference concerning them, and they must be left to the judgment of God, which, however hidden from us, is assuredly just and holy and good. This agnostic view of the fate of uncovenanted infants has been held, of course, in conjunction with every degree of hope or the lack of hope concerning them, and thus in the hands of the several theologians it approaches each of the other views, except, of course, the second, which separates itself from the general Calvinistic attitude by allowing a place for reprobation even among believers' infants, dying such. Petrus de Witte may stand for one example. He says : "We must adore God's judgments and not curiously inquire into them. Of the children of believers it is not to be doubted but that they shall be saved, inasmuch as they belong unto the covenant. But because we have no promise of the children of unbelievers we leave them to the judgment of God." [†] Matthew Henry [‡] and our own Jonathan Dickinson [§] may also stand as types. It is this cautious, agnostic view which has the best historical right to be called the common Calvinistic one. Van Mastricht correctly says that while the Reformed hold that infants are liable to reprobation, yet "concerning *believers'* infants . . . they judge better things. But *unbelievers'* infants, because the Scriptures determine nothing *clearly* on the subject, they judge should be left to the divine discretion." [‖]

The Reformed Confessions with characteristic caution refrain from all definition of the negative side of the salvation of infants, dying such, and thus confine themselves to emphasizing the gracious doctrine common to the whole body of Reformed thought. The fundamental Reformed doctrine of the Church is nowhere more beautifully stated than in the sixteenth article of the Old Scotch Confession, while the polemical appendix of 1580, in its protest against the errors of "antichrist," specifically mentions "his cruell judgement againis infants departing without the sacrament : his absolute necessitie of baptisme." No synod probably ever met which labored under greater temptation to declare that some infants, dying in infancy, are reprobate, than the Synod of Dort. Possibly nearly every member of it held as his private opinion that there are such infants; and the certainly very shrewd but scarcely sincere methods of the Remonstrants in shifting the form in which this question came before the synod were very irritating. But the fathers of Dort, with truly Reformed loyalty to the positive declarations of Scripture, confined themselves to a clear testimony to the positive doctrine of infant salvation and a repudiation of the calumnies of the Remonstrants, without a word of negative inference. "Since we are to judge of the will of God from his Word," they say, "which testifies that the children of believers are holy, not by nature, but in virtue of the covenant of grace in which they together with their parents are comprehended, godly parents have no reason to doubt of the election and salvation of their children whom it pleaseth God to call out of this life in their infancy" (Art. XVII.). Accordingly they repel in the Conclusion the calumny that the Reformed teach "that many children of the faithful are torn guiltless from their mothers' breasts and tyrannically plunged into hell." [*] It is easy to say that nothing is here said of the children of any but the "godly" and of the "faithful;" this is true, and therefore it is *not* implied (as is so often thoughtlessly asserted) that the contrary of what is here asserted is true of the children of the ungodly; but nothing is taught of them at all. It is more to the purpose to observe that it *is* asserted that the children of believers, dying such, are saved; and that this assertion is an inestimable advance on that of the Council of Trent and that of the Augsburg Confession that baptism is necessary to salvation. It is the confessional doctrine of the Reformed churches and of the Reformed churches alone, that all believers' infants, dying in infancy, are saved.

---

[*] *Opera*, iii., cols. 1173–74, § 22.

[†] It is, perhaps, worth noting that this is the general Calvinistic view of what "children of believers" means. Compare CALVIN, *Tracts*, vol. iii., p. 351.

[*] *Works*, x., 81 ; compare v., 137.

[†] *Catechism*, q. 37.

[‡] *Works*, ii., 940.

[§] *Sermons*, 205.

[‖] *Theoretico-Pract. Theol.* (1724), p. 308.

What has been said of the Synod of Dort may be repeated of the Westminster Assembly. The Westminster divines were generally at one in the matter of infant salvation with the doctors of Dort, but, like them, they refrained from any deliverance as to its negative side. That death in infancy does not prejudice the salvation of God's elect they asserted in the chapter of their Confession which treats of the application of Christ's redemption to his people: "All those whom God hath predestined unto life, and those only, he is pleased, in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call, by his word and Spirit, . . . so as they come most freely, being made willing by his grace. . . . Elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth." [*] With this declaration of their faith that such of God's elect as die in infancy are saved by his own mysterious working in their hearts, although incapable of the response of faith, they were content. Whether these elect comprehend all infants, dying such, or some only—whether there is such a class as non-elect infants, dying in infancy, their words neither say nor suggest. No Reformed confession enters into this question; no word is said by any one of them which either asserts or implies either that some infants are reprobated or that all are saved. What has been held in common by the whole body of Reformed theologians on this subject is asserted in these confessions; of what has been disputed among them the confessions are silent. And silence is as favorable to one type as to another.

Although the cautious agnostic position as to the fate of uncovenanted infants dying in infancy may fairly claim to be the historical Calvinistic view, it is perfectly obvious that it is not *per se* any more Calvinistic than any of the others. The adherents of all the types enumerated above are clearly within the limits of the system, and hold with the same firmness to the fundamental position that salvation is suspended on no earthly cause, but ultimately rests on God's electing grace alone, while our knowledge of who are saved depends on our view of what are the signs of election and of the clearness with which they may be interpreted. As these several types differ only in the replies they offer to the subordinate question, there is no "revolution" involved in passing from one to the other; and as in the lapse of time the balance between them swings this way or that, it can only be truly said that there is advance or retrogression, not in fundamental conception, but in the clearness with which details are read and with which the outline of the doctrine is filled up. In the course of time the agnostic view of the fate of uncovenanted infants, dying such, has given place to an ever-growing universality of conviction that these infants too, are included in the election of grace; so that to day few Calvinists can be found who do not hold with Toplady, and Doddridge, and Thomas Scott, and John Newton, and James P. Wilson, and Nathan L. Rice, and Robert J. Breckinridge, and Robert S. Candlish, and Charles Hodge, and the whole body of those of recent years whom the Calvinistic churches delight to honor, that all who die in infancy are the children of God and enter at once into his glory—not because original sin alone is not deserving of eternal punishment (for all are born children of wrath), nor because they are less guilty than others (for relative innocence would merit only relatively light punishment, not freedom from all punishment), nor because they die in infancy (for that they die in infancy is not the cause but the effect of God's mercy toward them), but simply because God in his infinite love has chosen them in Christ, before the foundation of the world, by a loving foreordination of them unto adoption as sons in Jesus Christ. Thus, as they hold, the Reformed theology has followed the light of the Word until its brightness has illuminated all its corners, and the darkness has fled away.

---

[*] The language here used has a not uninteresting history. It is Calvin's challenge to Castellio: "Put forth now thy virulence against God, who hurls innocent babes torn from their mothers' breasts into eternal death" (*De occulta Dei Providentia*, in *Opp.* ed., Amst., viii., pp. 644–45). The underlying conception that God condemns infants to eternal death seems to be Calvin's; but the mode of expression is Calvin's *reductio ad absurdum* (or rather *ad blasphemiam*) of Castellio's opinions. Nevertheless the Remonstrants allowed themselves in their polemic zeal to apply the whole sentiment to the orthodox, and that, even in a still more sharpened form—viz., with reference to *believers'* children. This very gross calumny the Synod repels. Its deliverance is subjected to a very sharp and not very candid criticism by Episcopius (*Opera* I., i., p. 176, and specially II., p. 28).

[*] *Westminster Confession of Faith*, X., i. and iii. The opinion that a body of non-elect infants dying in infancy and not saved is implied in this passage, although often controversially asserted, is not only a wholly unreasonable opinion exegetically, but is absolutely negatived by the history of the formation of this clause in the Assembly as recorded in the *Minutes*, and has never found favor among the expositors of the Confession. David Dickson's (1684) treatment of the section shows that he understands it to be directed against the Anabaptists; and all careful students of the Confession understand it as above, including Shaw, Hodge, Macpherson and Mitchell. The same is true of all schools of adherents to the Confession. See, *e.g.*, Lyman Beecher (*Spirit of the Pilgrims*, i., pp. 49, 81); cf. also Philip Schaff (*Creeds of Christendom*, i., 795).

7. The most serious peril which the orderly development of the Christian doctrine of the salvation of infants has had to encounter, as men strove, age after age, more purely and thoroughly to apprehend it, has arisen from the intrusion into Christian thought of what we may, without lack of charity, call the unchristian conception of man's natural innocence. For the task which was set to Christian thinking was to obtain a clear understanding of God's revealed purpose of mercy to the infants of a guilty and wrath-deserving race. And the Pelagianizing conception of the innocence of human infancy, in however subtle a form presented, put the solution of the problem in jeopardy by suggesting that it needed no solution. We have seen how some Greek Fathers cut the knot with the facile formula that infantile innocence, while not deserving of supernatural reward, was yet in no danger of being adjudged to punishment. We have seen how in the more active hands of Pelagius and his companions, as part of a great unchristian scheme, it menaced Christianity itself, and was repelled only by the vigor and greatness of an Augustine. We have seen how the same conception, creeping gradually into the Latin Church in the milder form of semi-Pelagianism, lulled her heart to sleep with suggestions of less and less ill-desert for original sin, until she neglected the problem of infant salvation altogether and comforted herself with a constantly attenuating doctrine of infant punishment. If infants are so well off without Christ, there is little impulse to consider whether they may not be in Christ.

The Reformed churches could not hope to work out the problem free from menace from the perennial enemy. The crisis came in the form of the Remonstrant controversy. The anthropology of the Remonstrants was distinctly semi-Pelagian, and on that basis no solid advance was possible. Nor was the matter helped by their postulation of a universal atonement which lost in intention as much as it gained in extension. Infants may have very little to be saved from, but their salvation from even it cannot be wrought by an atonement which only purchased for them the opportunity for salvation—an opportunity of which they cannot avail themselves, however much the natural power of free choice is uninjured by the fall, for the simple reason that they die infants; while God cannot be held to make them, without their free choice, partakers of this atonement without an admission of that sovereign discrimination among men which it was the very object of the whole Remonstrant theory to exclude. It is not strange that the Remonstrants looked with some favor on the Romish theory of *pœna damni.* Though the doctrine of the salvation of all infants dying in infancy became one of their characteristic tenets, it had no logical basis in their scheme of faith, and their proclamation of it could have no direct effect in working out the problem. Indirectly it had a twofold effect. On the one hand, it retarded the true course of the development of doctrine, by leading those who held fast to biblical teaching on original sin and particular election, to oppose the doctrine of the salvation of all dying in infancy, as if it were necessarily inconsistent with these teachings. Probably Calvinists were never so united in affirming that some infants, dying such, are reprobated, as in the height of the Remonstrant controversy. On the other hand, so far as the doctrine of the salvation of all infants, dying such, was accepted by the anti-Remonstrants, it tended to bring in with it, in more or less measure, the other tenets with which it was associated in their teaching, and thus to lead men away from the direct path along which alone the solution was to be found. Wesleyan Arminianism brought only an amelioration, not a thoroughgoing correction of the faults of Remonstrantism. The theoretical postulation of original sin and natural inability, corrected by the gift to all men of a gracious ability on the basis of universal atonement in Christ, was a great advance. But it left the salvation of infants dying in infancy logically as unaccounted for as original Remonstrantism. *Ex hypothesi*, the universal atonement could bring to these infants only what it brought to all others, and this was something short of salvation—viz., an ability to improve the grace given alike to all. But infants, dying such, cannot improve grace; and therefore, it would seem, cannot be saved, unless we suppose a special gift to them over and above what is given to other men—a supposition subversive at once of the whole Arminian contention. The assertion of the salvation of all infants dying in infancy, although a specially dear tenet of Wesleyan Arminianism, remains therefore, as with the earlier Remonstrants, unconformable to the system. The Arminian difficulty, indeed, lies one step further back; it does not make clear how *any* infant dying in infancy is to be saved.*

The truth seems to be that there is but one logical outlet for any system of doctrine which suspends the determination of who are to be saved upon any action of man's own will, whether in the use of gracious or natural ability (that is, of course, if it is unwilling to declare infants, dying such, incapable of salvation); and that lies in the extension of "the day of grace" for such into the other world. Otherwise, there will inevitably be brought in covertly, in the salvation of infants, that very sovereignty of God, "irresistible" grace and passive receptivity, to deny which is the whole *raison d'être* of these schemes. There are indications that this is being increasingly felt among those who are most concerned; we have noted it most recently among the Cumberland Presbyterians,* who, perhaps alone of Christian denominations, have embodied in their confession their conviction that all infants, dying such, are saved. The theory of a probation in the other world for such as have had in this no such probation as to secure from them a decisive choice has come to us from Germany, and bears accordingly a later Lutheran coloring. Its roots are, however, planted in the earliest Lutheran thinking,† and are equally visible in the writings of the early Remonstrants; its seeds are present, in fact, wherever man's salvation is decisively suspended on any act of his own. But the outcome offered by it certainly affords no good reason for affirming that all infants, dying such, are saved. It is not uncommon, indeed, for the advocates of this theory to suppose the present life to be a more favorable opportunity for moral renewal in Christ than the next.‡ Some, no doubt, think otherwise. But in either event what can assure us that *all* will be so renewed? We are ready to accept the subtle argument in Dr. Kedney's valuable work, *Christian Doctrine Harmonized*,§ as the best that can be said in the premises; for although Dr. Kedney denies the theory of "future probation" in general, he shares the general "ethical" view on which it is founded, and projects the salvation of infants dying in infancy into the next world on the express ground that they are incapable of choice here. He assures us that they will surely welcome the knowledge of God's love in Christ there. But we miss the grounds of assurance, on the fundamental postulates of the scheme. If the choice of these infants, while it remains free, can be made thus certain *there*, why not the same for all men *here?* And if their choice is thus made certain, is their destiny *determined* by their choice or by God, who makes that choice certain? Assuredly no thoroughfare is open along this path for a consistent doctrine of the salvation of all those that die in infancy. But this seems the only pathway that is consistently open to those, of whatever name, who make man's own undetermined act the determining factor in his salvation.‖

---

* The prevailing view in the Methodist Episcopal Church is probably that infants are all born justified. The difficulties of this view are hinted by a not unfriendly hand in *The Cumberland Presbyterian Review* for January, 1890, p. 113. The best that can be said toward placing the dying infant "in the same essential gracious position as that into which the justified and regenerate adult is brought by voluntary faith," may be read from Dr. D. D. Whedon's pen in *The Methodist Quarterly Review* for 1883, p. 757. It is inconsequent; and its consequences are portentous to Arminianism—or shall we say that God does not determine who are to die in infancy?

* *Cumberland Presbyterian Review*, July, 1890, p. 369: cf. January, 1890, p. 113.

† Cf. *e.g.*, Andreæ, *Actis Colloq. Montisbelligtar*, p. 447, 448; and note Beza's crushing reply.

‡ Cf. *Progressive Orthodoxy*, p. 76.

§ Vol. ii., pp. 91 *sq.*

‖ The Rev. D. Fisk Harris, himself a Congregational minister (*Calvinism Contrary to God's Word and Man's Moral Nature*, p. 107), tells us that a view not essentially differing from Dr Kedney's "seems to be the prevailing view of Congre-

8. The drifts of doctrine which have come before us in this rapid sketch may be reduced to three generic views. 1. There is what may be called the *ecclesiastical doctrine*, according to which the Church, in the sense of an outwardly organized body, is set as the sole fountain of salvation in the midst of a lost world; the Spirit of God and eternal life are its peculiar endowments, of which none can partake save through communion with it. Accordingly to all those departing this life in infancy, baptism, the gateway to the Church, is the condition of salvation. 2. There is what may be called the *gracious doctrine*, according to which the visible Church is not set in the world to determine by the gift of its ordinances who are to be saved, but as the harbor of refuge for the saints, to gather into its bosom those whom God himself in his infinite love has selected in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world in whom to show the wonders of his grace. Men accordingly are not saved because they are baptized, but they are baptized because they are saved, and the failure of the ordinance does not argue the failure of the grace. Accordingly to all those departing this life in infancy, inclusion in God's saving purpose alone is the condition of salvation; we may be able to infer this purpose from manifest signs, or we may not be able to infer it, but in any case it cannot fail. 3. There is what may be called the *humanitarian doctrine*, according to which the determining cause of man's salvation is his own free choice, under whatever variety of theories as to the source of his power to exercise this choice, or the manner in which it is exercised. Accordingly whether one is saved or not is dependent not on baptism or on inclusion in God's hidden purpose, but on the decisive activity of the soul itself.

The first of these doctrines is characteristic of the early, the mediæval, and the Roman churches, not without echoes in those sections of Protestantism which love to think of themselves as "more historical" or less radically reformed than the rest. The second is the doctrine of the Reformed churches. These two are not opposed to one another in their most fundamental conception, but are related rather as an earlier misapprehension and a later correction of the same basal doctrine. The phrase *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* is the common property of both; they differ only in their understanding of the "ecclesia," whether of the visible or invisible church. The third doctrine, on the other hand, has cropped out ever and again in every age of the Church, has dominated whole sections of it and whole ages, but has never, in its purity, found expression in any great historic confession or exclusively characterized any age. It is, in fact, not a section of Church doctrine at all, but an intrusion into Christian thought from without. In its purity it has always and in all communions been accounted heresy; and only as it has been more or less modified and concealed among distinctively Christian adjuncts has it ever made a position for itself in the Church. Its fundamental conception is the antipodes of that of the other doctrines.

The first step in the development of the doctrine of infant salvation was taken when the Church laid the foundation which from the beginning has stood firm, *Infants too are lost members of a lost race, and only those savingly united to Christ are saved.* In its definition of what infants are thus savingly united to Christ the early Church missed the path. All that are brought to him in baptism, was its answer. Long ages passed before the second step was taken in the correct definition. The way was prepared indeed by Augustine's doctrine of grace, by which salvation was made dependent on the dealings of God with the individual heart. But his eyes were holden that he should not see it. It was reserved to Zwingli to proclaim it clearly, *All the elect children of God, who are regenerated by the Spirit who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth.* The sole question that remains is, Who of those that die in infancy are the elect children of God? Tentative answers were given. The children of God's people, said some. The children of God's people, with such others as his love has set upon to call, said others. *All those that die in infancy* said others still; and to this reply Reformed thinking and not Reformed thinking only, but in one way or another, logically or illogically, the thinking of the Christian world has been converging. Is it the Scriptural answer? It is as legitimate and as logical an answer as any, on Reformed postulates. It is legitimate on no other postulates. If it be really conformable to the Word of God it will stand; and the third step in the development of the doctrine of infant salvation is already taken. But if it stand, it can stand on no other theological basis than the Reformed. If all infants dying in infancy are saved, it is certain that they are not saved by or through the ordinances of the visible Church (for they

---

gationalists." This he states thus: "All infants become moral agents after death. Exercising a holy choice, they 'are saved on the ground of the atonement and by regeneration.'"

have not received them), nor through their own improvement of a grace common to all men (for they are incapable of activity); it can only be through the almighty operation of the Holy Spirit who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth, through whose ineffable grace the Father gathers these little ones to the home he has prepared for them.

For The Magazine of Christian Literature.

IN THE BEGINNING WAS THE WORD.

Thoughts on St. John i. 1–5.

(*Translated from the German of Pastor W. F. Besser, by the Rev. Arthur Lloyd, M.A., Professor of Classics, Trinity College, Toronto, Can.*)

When St. John composed his Gospel, with a view to leaving it as a precious heirloom for the Church, the other three Gospels had already long been in the hands and hearts of Christians. For this reason he does not undertake to set forth in an orderly arrangement all that he has preserved of Christ in the treasury of his infinitely rich memory; but, as he says himself, "Many other signs there are that Jesus wrought in the presence of His disciples, which are not written in this book. But these things are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that through faith ye may have life in His name" (St. John xx. 30, 31). *Jesus Christ, the Son of God—through faith life in the Name of this Jesus:* in these two clauses is contained the summary of the Gospel of St. John. The ancient fathers were fond of comparing John to an eagle, and it is true that on wings of inward meditation he soars aloft to the loftiest summits of the blessed mysteries of our Redemption. His eye has been enlightened by the loving contemplation of the Light of Life, the sun has made it sun-like. "The Gospel of John," says an old teacher, "is a still deep lake in which are reflected the pleasant shores that surround it, and the deep clear sky above it, with sun, moon and stars." In early times he was called the Theologian, the divine instructed in the things of God (cf. the title of the Book of Revelation). But it was no human wisdom, but the divine unction (1 John ii. 20) that gave him his learned tongue; the unction flowing from a personal union of an adoring, sacrificing soul with her eternal bridegroom. Luther says of this "theology": "John speaks poorly and simply, like an infant, and his words have to the ears of the worldly wise a very childish sound; but beneath them there is hidden so great a majesty that no man, be he never so enlightened, can fathom or express them;" and Löhe describes the Johannic style as follows: "What is it that makes the writings of the holy Apostle John so extraordinarily interesting to us; what is that force whereby when we hear or read them they so powerfully take possession of our souls? It is true, there is in them a tone of simplicity and love; but whence comes this simplicity and love? It is not the simplicity of the child, but that of a Seraph, and the love is not of the kind that the world has and gives, but such as blossoms around the everlasting throne of the blessed Son of God. It is the simplicity of *possession*, which reappears in the simplicity of form, and it is the love for the One on whose breast the loving disciple lay at the Supper, which produces the language of love. Simple love for the One Jesus, who is True Man but also True God and Everlasting Life, this it is that speaks from the mouth of John, and compels the spirits, the spirits of men, of all, that is, that come into the world, to yearn after the beloved Master of St. John, and for the bosom on which he lay." On the bosom of Jesus the fire which burnt so mightily in the maiden spirit of John—the Jeremiah of the New Testament—was kindled into that still glow of holy love whereof we sing, when we offer ourselves in holy metaphor upon the altar of praise that we may be wholly consumed by the glowing coals upon the Altar of Eternal love;* and the words of his mouth are the echoing thunder accompanying the flashing lightning of the love of his life (Mark iii. 17). Whatever Jesus *does* is, to the spirit of the disciple, filled with the glory of the only begotten Son, a *sign* pointed to by the *word* of the Lord. As he spoke to Peter when he saw the Risen One standing on the shores of the Lake of Gennesareth, so he speaks continually in joyful accents to the reader of his Gospel—"It is the Lord."

It will be well for us if in reading the Gospel we can make our own the experience of Claudius: "Whenever I read in John I feel as though I saw him at the Last Supper lying before me on the bosom of his Master, as though his angel held the light for me, and at certain passages wished to fall on my neck and whisper something in my ear. I am very far indeed from understanding all that I read, but yet I often seem to catch a distant glimpse of what John meant; and even when I look at a totally obscure passage, I yet have a presentiment of a great majestic meaning which I shall some day comprehend."

---

* I have not ventured to translate the exact words of the poem which I have paraphrased in my translation.

Trage Gluth auf den Altar,
Opfre Dir mich ganz und gar,
Dass von mir doch Nichts mehr bliebe,
O du allerliebste Liebe.

V. 1. *In the beginning was the Word.* Mark, too, commences with this word: "The *beginning* of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (Mark i. 1). But John speaks of another beginning than that which was made by the voice of the Preacher in the Wilderness. He goes further back than Matthew, who commences with Abraham, whose promised seed is Jesus Christ the Son of David; further back than Luke, who traces the genealogical tree of the Son of Man to Adam, the first originator of sinful generations. As Moses deals with the history of creation, so John deals with his Gospel. "In the beginning." Only John goes higher even than Moses. *In the beginning,* before God created the heaven and the earth, the Word already *Was.* It *came not into being,* but it *was:* there was no time when it was not, for it is the Everlasting Word. Before this Word, which is announced in the Gospel, appeared in time, it *was in the beginning* (cf. 1 St. John i. 1–3); ere it became the Light and Life of men it *was with God;* ere it became Flesh, it was God.

John uses the name *Word* to describe the everlasting Son of the everlasting Father. the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father (v. 18). This name he uses, because through Him were all things made that were made (v. 3), because He is the Creative Word of God (Gen. i. 3, cf. Heb. xi. 3; Ps. xxxiii. 6, 9), and because Life is in Him (v. 4), and He is the Word of Life (1 John i. 1, 2). It is not only that He *has* and *bears* the Word of God; He *is* this Word which God sends (Ps. cvii. 20, cxlvii. 15, Acts x. 36); His name is called the Word of God (Rev. xix. 13). He who speaks through the prophet: "Behold, I myself that speak will be there" (Isa. lii. 6), the living God as His own Revealer, He is the Word (cf. cap. viii. 25 and Heb. i. 1, 2). The recognition that the One God is no *solitary* God, that in the perfect divine Being which is Everlasting life, an *I* and a *Thou* and a *We* are enclosed and associated together in love, is to be seen here and there even in the Old Testament, though there the ore lies "half buried in the mine." Through the whole of the Old Testament from Genesis to Malachi strides the *Angel of the Lord,* the Angel who is distinguished from the other angels in this that God's *Name,* the complete fulness of the Divine Attributes, is *in Him* (Ex. xxiii. 21), and that thus the Being of God is reflected in Him as in the *Angel of His Presence*[*] (Isa. lxiii. 9, cf. Heb. 1, 3; Col. i. 15). In Him God looks lovingly upon His Own Self, and through Him God reveals Himself to whomsoever He will. We may compare also the personified Wisdom of God in Proverbs viii., especially in verses 22 and 23, and St. Matthew xi. 19. In the Word which was God "from the beginning," God ever expressed His Being, placed in it the fulness of His gifts, for it is "a word which God has with Himself in His Divine Being, and which is the thought of His heart. He therefore says of Himself that the Godhead is wholly in it, and that He that has the Word has the whole of the Godhead. There is likewise in it the whole of the heart of God, just as we recognize the heart of man in the word of man; only here the likeness is not quite complete, for the human word bears with it distinctly only the nature (or contents) of the human heart, but here the divine Heart is itself naturally and actually in the Word" (Luther). Or as Brenz, agreeing with the Fathers, says: "As the stream is never separated from the fountain, as the ray is never divided from the Sun, so also the Son of God is never separated nor divided from the Father."

"*And the Word was with God*"—*with* God. not only *in* Him. It was God's assessor,[†] "the man that is God's fellow" (Zech. xiii. 7). Not an attribute remaining in God nor a force proceeding from him, but the Word is a *person,* an independent "*I*" echoing to the "*Thou*" of the Divine Love, and filled with the contents of the Divine Life. In the Greek word corresponding to the English *with* (πρὸς τὸν θεὸν—toward God) the idea of mutual love is emphasized, and the Word is represented as eternally turned toward God. John wishes to tell us not only *where* the Word was, but *how* it was in its eternal association of love with God. Here then we have *two:* God and the Word. But the Word—personally distinguished from God—is *a different person* indeed, but *not a different thing,* and therefore, lest any one should ever separate in essence (*οὖσια,* substance) the Word from God, or the Son from the Father, St. John turns round again, closes the circle of his argument, and says:

And the Word was God. If you ask

---

[*] Lit. *Engel seines Angesichts*—"angel of His countenance."
[†] "Beimann."

when was the Word? St. John answers: "In the beginning." If you ask, "How was the Word?" St. John replies, "It was with God." If you further ask, "What was the Word?" he answers, "The Word was God"—"equal God of Might and Honor." Hence we see that the Apostle, in speaking of the Father whose Son the Word is, calls Him God absolutely ("the Word was with *God*"), but he immediately says of the Word that his essence is God. So then there are not two Gods but one God, and yet John teaches us to distinguish the divine Persons, the one with whom the Word is and the one who is the Word. Now the Apostle combines the first and third clauses of this verse with the second clause, and continues:

V. 2. *The same*—this Word which was God—*was in the beginning with God.* In the beginning, the Word, which itself was God, was with God. It was not in the beginning contained as it were in God, so that it became a distinct person only when it became flesh and dwelt among us (v. 14); but as being God of God it was in the beginning with God. Before it dwelt among us it was from everlasting with God, and before a created Being existed to be made blessed through the Word, the Eternal Word was itself the life and blessedness of God, "blessed forever" (1 Tim. vi. 15). But in order that the blessed life, which was in the eternal Word with God, may be participated in by creatures to the praise of that Love which communicates it to them, therefore has God created a World and created it through that same Word in which He had from everlasting an object of His love.

V. 3. *All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made.* The Word *was:* all things *were made* through the Word. Everything without exception—the Angels in the height, the worm in the dust—owes its existence to the Word. There is nothing that has not been made, and there is nothing made that has not been made through the uncreated eternal Word. The ranks of created beings do not contain this Son; they were made through Him, therefore He must be their Creator. Not as though the Son had only like an instrument carried out the creative will of the Father; rather, the Son Himself is the *revealed will* of the Father, and in this will is to be found the cause of creation. This idea is thus expressed by the Apostle Paul (Col. i. 16): "*In* Him were all things created both in heaven and earth;" and then as a proof that He through whom all things were created is also the foreseen and provided Life-container* of all created things, he adds: "All things were made through Him and *for* Him, and He is before all things, and all things exist in Him." "I have manifested Thee upon earth" is the prayer which the Son offers in his high priestly character (St. John xvii. 4); with this manifestation was completed the work of the divine Love, which commenced when the World was created through the word and *for* the Word —*i.e.*, to the end that the world might become a participator in the majesty which the Word had eternally with God.

Here let us stand still for a moment and rightly comprehend the comfort of this article of faith which John, the paragon of the evangelists, so forcibly lays down for us. He carries our Lord Jesus Christ far beyond Adam and all creatures into unending eternity and teaches us to recognize in Him the eternal Word, who was in the beginning before the world was created (Ps. xc. 2); who was with God as His beloved Son; who was God of one substance with the Father; through whom all Creation was called into being. Thus powerfully does the Apostle teach the true Divinity of Christ, in order that our faith may have a foundation in the Scripture which wavereth not. Joyfully may we place our trust in this Christ, for He is no Creature, but true God (Jeremiah xvii. 5). Our salvation is rooted in this Word which was in the beginning with God (Eph. i. 4). He who has redeemed us with His precious Blood is the same who has also created us; for He that should redeem lost mankind could not be inferior to Him by whom and for whom mankind was originally created. "This article of our Salvation and Blessedness we can never grasp and comprehend through human reason, but we must believe it as the Scripture speaks thereof, and must therefore hold fast the belief that Christ, our Lord, is true and natural God, equal to the Father in divine Substance and Nature. If Christ remain not true natural God, born of the Father from everlasting, and the Creator of all creatures, then are we lost. For how should I be benefited by the Passion and Death of the Lord Christ if He were only a man as thou art? Then could He not have conquered Devil, Death or Sin. He would have been far too weak for them. Therefore must we have such a Saviour who is true God, and Lord over Sin, Death, the Devil and Hell. If He, as the Son of God, shed

---

* Vorherversehenes Lebensinhalt alles Geschaffenen.

His Blood for us that He might redeem us and purify us from sin, and if we believe it and hold it before the Devil's nose when he terrifies and plagues us on account of our sins, then is the Devil soon defeated; he must retire and leave us at ease. For the hook—that is, the Divinity of Christ, was well concealed beneath the worm—that is, His Humanity (which the Devil swallowed when Christ died and was buried), and tore his belly so that he could not retain Him, but was forced to let Him go, who forthwith swallowed up death, which is our highest comfort. For just as he failed to retain Christ in death, so also will he be unable to retain under the power of death those that believe on Christ. With this preface to the Gospel of St. John, and with the Symbol of Nicæa we can forcibly throw to the ground the devil and all heretics that ever were or can be. For though the heretics ventured to master and pervert this Gospel with a specious show of being in accordance with reason; yet in the end was their folly made manifest and condemned by Christendom as a diabolic lie, and so disappeared with shame" (Luther).

II.

All things were made through the Word; but the same Word which is the free cause of their coming into existence is also the sole reason of their continuance (chap. v. 17).

V. 4. *In Him was Life.* The essence of the Word is Life, because it is God, and everything that lives derives its vital force only from Him, for out of God there is no life (chap. v. 26). John knows only one divine, blessed, everlasting life; that which separates itself from God falls into death, and that which returns not to God remains in death. Whatever, outside of and without God, boasts itself of life, is but masked death. In the mouth of John the noble term "life" always (it occurs fifty-four times in the Gospel) conveys the idea of divine life. In our language it is true (as well as occasionally in Holy Scripture) we do speak of a life without God, a sinful, worldly, earthly, transient, unhappy life; John, however, has assigned the term "life" exclusively to that which is essentially life (1 Tim. vi. 19)—*i.e.*, to that which has its origin in the divine fulness of life, and its existence in communion with God. When "God saw all that He had made, and behold it was very good" (Gen. i. 31), He beheld only life derived from His life, and His Pleasure rested upon all Creation. Never failing life and unfading bloom poured forth without ceasing from the source of all life. Since the earth and that which it contains is no longer very good, but is corrupted through sin and separated from God, Death has obtained dominion (Rom. viii. 20); but again, on the other hand, that which in the midst of a corrupting world has life has ever lived and still to-day lives only *in Him* whose Love is stronger than death, and whose quickening spirit renews the face of the earth (Ps. civ. 30; Acts xvii. 18; Col. i. 17; Heb. i. 3).

Hitherto the Apostle has shown us the everlasting Word as the Source of Life for "all things," he now goes further and shows us what Man especially derives from it.

And the life was the light of men. The life of the everlasting Word, the bearer and sustainer of all things was the light of men. Of all creatures man alone, created in the image of God, recognizes the life which fills him; man alone can say: "*I* live, God is *my life;* for he alone is a Person, an "*I*" quickened by divine life; the living breath breathed into him by God (Gen. ii. 7) speaks in his heart: "I live—thou, O Lord God, art my life!" And for this reason, because fellowship with the Life, which has and is the everlasting Word, manifests itself in the spirit of man as a loving *recognition* of God, the Apostle says, "The life was the *light* of men." Earthly light is bright and makes bright, shows light and enlightens: it is in the Scripture the continuous symbol of the holy and sanctifying God, of Him who has life in Himself and imparts life to others, of Him who is true and who leads into truth. "With Thee is the Well of Life; in Thy light shall we see light" (Ps. xxxvi. 10). Life and light are in nature inseparably connected with one another; so is it also in the sphere of the Spirit; where there is divine, holy life, there is also divine holy light, and where there is light there is also life. Our Apostle knows no light worthy of the name but what has radiated forth from the life of the everlasting light (cf. viii. 12; ix. 5; xii. 35; 1 John ii. 8; Col. i. 12; 2 Tim. i. 10). Outside of God in Christ there is no light but pure darkness; just as out of Him there is no life but only death. In Christ is the Light of Life; out of Christ, the night of death. "When he says, 'In Him was life, and the life was the light of men,' it is a thunderbolt directed against the light of reason, free will, human powers, etc. It is as though he would say, All men that are out of Christ lack life before God, and are dead and damned. For how can they have life, seeing that they not only walk in darkness, but are darkness?" (Luther.)

The life *was* the light of men—*i.e.,* from the beginning, from the time that men first were. Just as the everlasting Word was God in the beginning, so it was from the beginning the life and light of men. It is true that when, in consequence of sin, death and darkness overtook men, it seemed as though, in the world deprived of Paradise, Life and Light had been extinguished forever, as they have perished forever in the abode of the devil and his angels (Jude 6). But no! Praised be the everlasting love which inclines itself to misled sinners, in order to overcome death with its life and darkness with its light!

V. 5. *And the light shineth in darkness.* The life was from the beginning the light of men, and thus as the light of men it *shines* now in the place into which men have fallen—*in the darkness.* In Paradise everything was perfect life and light. We cannot properly say that the light shone in Paradise; Paradise itself shone as a luminary. But since sin has entered into the world, and since the race of men alienated from the life which exists in the love of God walks in the darkness instead of in the light—since that time the light is shining in the darkness, and the blacker the darkness is, the more brilliant is the light in the darkness (Rom. v. 20). But how does the light shine in the darkness? Read Gen. iii. 15. There, in the Protesangelium, the first ray of light falls upon the poor darkened world; the life which from the beginning has been the light of men falls upon the sinner as a sweet light of mercy; the everlasting Word, the *Creator* of a holy, living, bright world, begins to reveal Himself as the *Redeemer* of a sinful, mortal, dark world. All that the divine love has ever instituted for the redemption of fallen manhood, from the first promise of the victorious Woman-Seed, crusher of the Serpent, down to the fulfilment of the promise, can be summed up as being a shining of the light in the darkness. How clearly was the light burning when a Noah, an Abraham, a Moses, finally, when the whole of the Covenant people were the bearers of this light! The whole economy of the old Covenant is lighted up by the light of the Salvation offered to sinners; the Covenant, the Law, the Worship with its Types are all rays of the light that penetrates the darkness. Christ is the Hidden Light* of the whole Old Testament. Yes; even those nations who before the light of oral revelation had wandered astray on their own ways were never left absolutely without light in their darkness (Acts xiv. 16). God was never far from them, although they had removed themselves far from God (Acts xvii. 27). Sparks of light flashed even into the dark heathen hearts; for creation without speech or language preached to them the living God, and their conscience spoke of His Law (Rom. i. 20, ii. 15), and countless heathen sacrifices bear witness to the thoughts of their conscience accusing and excusing one another. With silent but powerful step the living God strides through the history of the nations, and even the loud stamping of human feet does not prevent the human ear from hearing this secret and solemn march of God. The revelation of God in His righteous judgments has at all times flashed like lightning over the darkness of the World, and still does so; over the raging sea of the peoples there still can be heard in unmistakable accents the words of the second Psalm, "Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and so ye perish from the right way."

But how fares it with the light which draws men out of darkness? *And the darkness comprehended it not.* John here gives to those who refuse to be illuminated by the light the name of *darkness.* All those, and there were many of them, who loved the darkness more than the light (iii. 19) and became so identified with the darkness as to obtain the name of "darkness," these did not comprehend the light that shone on them nor hold it fast. St. Paul (Rom. i. 18) has a similar thought—"Men hold the truth in unrighteousness;" the love of unrighteousness extinguishes the spark of truth thrown by the light into their heart, so that it fails to kindle a flame. Thus no man that walks in the darkness has any excuse. The darkness in which all men alike are placed by nature will not be the cause of our condemnation; for the light shines in the darkness, willing and able to overcome it. But the *love of darkness,* which renders us unable to comprehend the light, will condemn us if we die in it. It is true that not only darkness but the love of darkness is our inheritance as sinners. But it is also true that the Light, our Lord Jesus Christ, kindles in us such a flame of love that the love for Him which He effects in us breaks and dispels the love for the darkness if we will only acquiesce in his illumination and not meet it with dark reluctance. It is true, the Everlasting Light as long as He has been shining in the darkness has ever found those who stretched out their hands to Him, and did not wish to remain in the darkness after they had seen the Light (compare verse 12 with verse 11) ; but there were but few of these. In the deepest anguish St. John looks upon the work of love wrought by the everlasting Word among the sinful race, and in sorrowful words describes the history of the World and her peoples—"The light shineth in the darkness, but the darkness comprehended it not." .

---

* Lichtinhalt.

THE LATE DEAN CHURCH.

BY CANON MALCOM MACCOLL.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), January, 1891.

[Instead of a formal biographical sketch it has seemed best to give the following articles on Dean Church, largely reminiscent and descriptive. Readers may be grateful, however, for a brief summary of facts. Richard William Church was born at Cintra, April 25, 1815 ; took first-class honors at Oxford, in 1836, and shortly afterward was elected Fellow of Oriel College ; was rector of Whatley from 1853 to 1871, when he was appointed Dean of St. Paul's. His principal writings are : *Essays and Reviews* (1854), *Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford* (1868), *Life of St. Anselm* (1871), *The Beginning of the Middle Ages* (1877), *Dante: an Essay* (1878), *Spenser* (1879). He died at Dover, December 2, 1890.—Ed.]

In the beginning of this year I was called upon, at short notice, to put down in this *Review* some obituary impressions of the late Dr. Ignatius von Döllinger. I now venture, on still shorter notice, to pay such tribute as I can to the memory of the late Dean of St. Paul's. In the interval Lightfoot, Liddon, Newman have passed away. The extinction of five such luminaries in the ecclesiastical firmament is a rare event in the course of one year. They had much in common ; but it might be said of each of them that "his soul was like a star and dwelt apart." The greatest of them, taking him all round, was undoubtedly Dr. Döllinger, greatest in intellectual range and in extent and minute accuracy of erudition. His learning was vast and various, but was ever at his command in its smallest details. His large library filled several rooms opening into each other, most of the shelves holding two rows of books, one behind the other. In the room next the one in which Dr. Döllinger himself worked it was my privilege to have a table whenever I went to Munich ; and when I wanted a reference, no matter what the subject, he could tell me in a moment where to find it, and if I did not light upon it at once he would jump up with an agility hardly impaired by the weight of more than fourscore years and a half (last time I saw him), and put his hand upon the volume, even when a row of books stood in front of it. His spare form and exuberant vitality seemed to defy the ordinary law of decay. He knew not what illness was till the prevalent influenza seized him ; and even that he shook off with comparative ease and was in a fair way toward recovery, when, rashly venturing on his usual cold bath, he received his death-stroke. Döllinger had a great admiration for Newman, who was about a year his junior, but he thought him a rash controversialist, sometimes damaging his own cause more than his opponent's. I happened to be at Munich when a letter was published from Dr. Newman against Anglican Orders, the validity of which he impugned on *à priori* rather than on historical grounds ; not because any historical flaw could be proved, but because God was not likely to commit the custody of His sacraments to such careless stewards as the Anglican clergy were alleged to be. "That argument," said Döllinger to me, "is more fatal to Newman's Roman Orders than to his Anglican, for nothing could exceed the confusion and carelessness in such matters which prevailed in Italy in mediæval times." And he proceeded to give a number of illustrations, adding : "The fact is, Newman's knowledge of the first four centuries of Christianity is unsurpassed ; but there are few men of ability and learning so ignorant as he of the history of the Middle Ages, and that explains much." It is indeed curious how one-sided Newman's reading was — how much it was governed by his prepossessions. I remember asking his opinion some years ago on a pamphlet which argued that the Athanasian Creed was probably written by St. Augustine. He wrote back that he was not competent to give an opinion, as he was "not acquainted with St. Augustine." Of course, he must have meant that he had not made a study of St. Augustine. Yet it was a sentence from that great Father that shook Newman's faith in the English Church, and was the most potent cause of his conversion to the Church of Rome. The incident marks so characteristically the contrast between the cast of Newman's mind and Church's, that it is instructive to notice it. Cardinal Wiseman had written an article on the Donatist Schism, with an application to the English Church. Newman "read it, and did not see much in it." But one of his friends called his attention to St. Augustine's phrase, "Securus judicat orbis terrarum," quoted in the article. The friend "repeated those words again and again," says Newman; "and when he was gone they kept running in my ears. They were words which went beyond the occasion of the Donatists. . . . What a light was hereby thrown upon every controversy in the Church! . . . Who can account for the impressions which are made on him? For a mere sentence, the words of St. Augustine struck me with a power which I never had felt from any words before. To take a familiar instance, they were like the 'Turn again, Whittington,' of the chime; or, to take a more serious one, they were like the 'Tolle, lege; tolle, lege,' of the child, which converted St. Augustine himself. 'Securus judicat orbis terrarum!' By those great words of the ancient Father, interpreting and summing-up the long and varied course of ecclesiastical history, the theory of the *Via Media* was absolutely pulverised." Truly an amazing proposition! St. Augustine was writing against a handful of Christians in Africa who had separated from and excommunicated the rest of Christendom because the Catholic Church continued to hold communion with men whom the Donatists accused of flagrant sin. It was a question of morals, not of faith, which was in dispute, and St. Augustine argued that Christendom at large (*orbis terrarum*) was a safe guide in such a matter, the *onus probandi* being on those who seceded from the ecclesiastical body and condemned it. That is true as a general principle; but St. Augustine did not even propound it as a general principle; the context restricts the phrase to the particular case of the Donatists. Yet in Newman's vivid imagination it suddenly assumed the portentous significance of a divine oracle proclaiming the infallibility of the Church of Rome.

The process of reasoning, the mental attitude toward great issues, revealed by this episode in Newman's religious development is quite foreign to the intellectual *ethos* of Dean Church. I cannot exhibit the difference better than by a quotation from the Dean's fine sermon on "Responsibility for our Belief":

> "It is said, and rightly said, that we must follow truth wherever it leads us. Any one who believes in truth at all must say it. But I think that following truth is sometimes confounded with yielding to the immediate pressure of an argument—which is a very different thing. For I am sure it cannot be too much remembered—what the history of every controversy shows; and every controversy and argument has a most curious history, full of strange turns and eventful surprises—that the form and pressure of an argument at any particular time has much in it of what we call accident. . . . Further, though argument is the natural means of getting at the verdict of reason, it is only a means and step, part of a process more complex and subtle than itself. For reason is wide and manifold, and waits its time; an argument is partial, one-sided, and often *then* most effective when least embarrassed by seeing too much: and one link left out, one fact overlooked, one step missed, may vitiate the most triumphant argument, as one element forgotten vitiates the whole of a long and intricate calculation. Again, the weight of an argument, like the significance of an event, is itself determined by many things without it. It will appear very different to the old and the young; to the happy and to the miserable. Very different to the same mind in the intoxication of success and popularity, or in the depression of failure and rebuke; in the whirl of society and the sunshine of an easy life, or on the bed of sickness, of hopelessness, of death; *before* and *after* travel, with its enlargement or its dissipation of mind; in the free air of the mountains and the sea, or within the bounds of a quiet and narrow study. Its force varies as a man is surrounded by those who take for granted one set of assumptions and conclusions, or by those who oppose them or are indifferent. . . . Let us believe what all experience shows, the large part which the qualities of our moral nature, its self-discipline and refinement, must have in all questions which touch what is moral and spiritual: how profoundly, how indirectly, intellectual work is influenced by modesty, reverence, honesty. Be patient, be just, be tolerant, be hopeful, be humble. In our greatest differences, and in proportion as our own convictions are deep, let us not be afraid to be equitable, considerate, generous. . . . And remember what an element *time* is in all growth; how much *time* alone does in making troubled questions run clear; how often what perplexes us to-day is all explained to-morrow; how what is tangled by dispute and confusion of thought may become unravelled by simply waiting. By simply waiting our horizon widens—widens almost without our knowing it. . . . Those who undertake to woo Truth by their own courage and venture, must not stumble at her conditions. They must not think it strange if for that Divine Bride they have to serve the seven years, and then the seven years more."

But what of those who have sought Truth loyally, yet have not found it when the end has come? Dean Church had no difficulty in facing that question. Be sincere with your intellect, he said. Play no tricks with it; "do not shrink from its full play, but be watchful over the heart and its temptations."

> "I should be disloyal to Him, whom I believe in and worship as the Lord of truth, if I doubted that such seeking would at last find Him. Even if it do not find Him *here*, man's destiny stops not at the grave; and many, we may be sure, will know Him *there* who did not know Him *here*. Be the stages what they may, as rough, as strange, as pro-

longed as they often seem to be, true and earnest seeking cannot be in vain; they will lead the honest and good heart to the truth, and at last to the light it longs for."

I have quoted this long passage because it gives the key to Dean Church's character. Indomitable love of truth, sincerity, humility, equity, generosity, patience — these formed the ethical soil in which his mind was rooted. Consequently, he never lost his balance in any of the surging controversies of the last fifty years; while others, some of them men of great name, gave up hope and left the field—some for Rome, some for Agnosticism, some for weary Indifferentism. And even of those who remained, some, not excluding the most distinguished, were more than once frightened or hurried into rash courses. Dr. Pusey prevailed on the bulk of his party to join the *Record* and the Evangelical party in denunciation of "Essays and Reviews," and of the nomination of one of the Essayists (the present Bishop of London) to the See of Exeter. He afterwards hastened to denounce as heterodox the concordat on the *Filioque* agreed upon at the Bonn Conference in 1875 by a distinguished assembly of Old Catholics, Oriental, and Anglican divines (including Dr. Liddon). But in all the controversies of his time Church kept a clear, cool head, knowing "how much time alone does in making troubled questions run clear." And time has vindicated his wisdom. He felt the magic of Newman's personal influence; he admired and loved him; he more than any one else quashed by the Proctors' veto the University condemnation of Tract 90. Yet in the cataclysm of Newman's secession, which at the time seemed to shatter the High Church party, and which made even Pusey and Keble tremble for the issue, Church's faith and courage never wavered. Convinced of the truth of his position, he awaited the result with confidence. His attitude was equally brave and confident in the Gorham controversy, the "Essays and Reviews" controversy, the Ritualistic controversy, and the comparatively insignificant controversy about "Lux Mundi." In all these controversies he deprecated an appeal to law courts or popular passion, however much he may have disapproved of the conduct of those who had provoked the controversy. He believed that "Truth was greatest and would prevail" in the end—believed it so entirely that he was not afraid to let Truth enter the arena of public discussion and abide by the ordeal of fair combat; not immediately perhaps, but in the long run.

I have compared and contrasted in some respects Newman and Church, master and disciple, albeit a very independent disciple. It was my privilege—and a great privilege and pleasure it was—to enjoy Cardinal Newman's friendship for the last five-and-twenty years of his life. He wrote to me with great frankness and freedom on questions of the day, and I subjoin a quotation from one of his letters which illustrates my theme, and is exceedingly interesting in itself. I shall quote nothing to which either he or any friend of his could object. A rumour had reached me that he was engaged on a book on the mutual relations of Faith and Reason, in connection with "Essays and Reviews," and having had occasion to write to him on another subject, I took the opportunity of referring to this rumour. He said in reply:

"I assure you I look with the most anxious interest at the state of Oxford, the more so because I anticipated its present perplexities; and it was one of my sorest trials in leaving it, that I was undoing my own work and leaving the field open, or rather infallibly surrendering it, to those who would break down and crumble to powder all religion whatever. As to the authors of 'Essays and Reviews,' some of them at least, I am sure, know not what they do. One of them I may still call my friend, and for two others, though I do not know them, I feel great respect. These, I trust, are urged by a sincere feeling that it is not right to keep up shams. Yet did they really see the termination, or rather the abyss, to which these speculations lead, surely they would see that, before attempting to sift facts, they ought to make sure that they have a firm hold of true and eternal principles. To unsettle the minds of a generation when you give them no landmarks and no causeway across the morass is to undertake a great responsibility.

"The religion of England depends, humanly speaking, on belief in the Bible, the whole Bible, etc., and on the observance of the Calvinistic Sabbath. Let the population begin to doubt in its inspiration and infallibility—where are we? Alas! whole classes do already; but I would not be the man knowingly to introduce scepticism into those portions of the community which are as yet sound. Consider the misery of wives and mothers losing their faith in Scripture; yet I am told this sad process is commencing.

"What I have said is not a gratuitous intrusion of my own thoughts upon you, but is virtually an answer to your question about myself. The volume in question, I know, is levelled at Revelation as a whole, but is especially a blow at the Old Testament. Now the plenary inspiration of Scripture is peculiarly a Protestant question; not a Catholic. We, indeed, devoutly receive the whole Bible as the word of God: but we receive it on the authority of the Church, and the Church has defined very little as to the aspects under which it comes from God, and the limits of its inspiration. Supposing, for argument sake, that it could be proved that some passage in the Pentateuch about Egyptian history were erroneous; nay, let the universality of the deluge over the globe, or the literal interpretation of Genesis, be, for argument sake, disproved, it would not affect a Catholic, for two reasons:—1. Because the Church has not made them points *de fide ;* and 2, because not the Bible, but the Church, is to him the oracle of Revelation ; so that, though the whole Scripture were miraculously removed from the world as if it had never been, evil and miserable as would be the absence of such a privilege, he would still have enough motives and objects for his faith. Whereas to the Protestant the question of Scripture is one of life and death.

"You see then, much as I grieve at what is taking place, I feel no call on me to interpose in the controversy. And the more because *we* shall have a controversy of our own—viz., with Atheism. My own belief is that, if there be a God, Catholicism is true ; but this is the elementary, august, and sovereign truth, the denial of which is in progress. May He Himself give grace to those who shall be alive on that terrible day to fight His battle well."

In reply I said, *inter alia*, that I did not think the religion of England did depend on "the observance of the Calvinistic Sabbath," and on the popular view of "the plenary inspiration of Scripture ;" that I saw no sign of the decay of Christianity ; that since he had left her, the progress of the Church of England had been forward, not backward—so much so, that the battle which he had thought lost when he left us had been practically won. How could he account for that fact, if the Church of England was no part of the body of Christ, and the Spirit of God was not energising within her ? One sentence from his long answer will suffice for my purpose here. "As to your question about the growth of Church principles in the Anglican Church, I rejoice in the *fact ;* but as to the *why,* there is another hypothesis besides that of serving as a note to the Apostolicity of Anglicanism ; it may be to prepare for a large addition of members to the Roman Catholic Church."

I saw him the year after the Vatican Council, and he asked me whether I thought that one of the effects of the Vatican decrees would be to prevent conversions from the Church of England. I answered in the affirmative. "That is my own opinion," he said. I reminded him of his suggested explanation of the growth of Church principles in the English Church since his secession. He shook his head sadly, and said : "The ways of God are inscrutable."

The fact is, Newman's strong feelings and fervid imagination tended to make him see facts and their correlations, not as they were, but as he desired them to be. He first made up his mind ; and then, with perfect sincerity, singleness of purpose, and consummate controversial skill, he accommodated the facts to his theory. He has confessed this himself in his description of his position as an Anglican. "I was angry with the Anglican divines," he says. "I thought they had taken me in ; I had read the Fathers with their eyes ; I had sometimes trusted their quotations or their reasonings ; and from reliance on them, I had used words or made statements which by right I ought rigidly to have examined myself. I had thought myself safe while I had their warrant for what I said. I had exercised more faith than criticism in the matter. I was in a humour certainly to bite off their ears." Writing to Keble in 1840, while still Vicar of St. Mary's, he said : "I do not think that we have yet made fair trial how much the English Church will bear : I know it is a hazardous experiment—like proving cannon. Yet we must not take it for granted that the metal will burst in the operation. It has borne, at various times, not to say at this time, a great infusion of Catholic truth without damage." "The *arguments* which I have published against Romanism seem to myself as cogent as ever ; but men go by their sympathies, not by argument :" and he "feels the force of this influence himself." St. Augustine's "Securus judicat orbis terrarum" was still ringing in his ears ; and as, under its influence, he felt the *Via Media* theory, which he had built without due examination on the Anglican divines, quaking under his feet, he set himself to construct another theory that would enable him to get round the "arguments against Romanism," which were still "as cogent as ever" to his intellect, by reconciling history to his "sympathies." This was the theory of Development—a theory to which, as expounded by Newman, the Church of Rome refused to commit herself, and he was advised to publish his book before he was received into her communion. There is, of course, a legitimate theory of the development of Christian doctrine, when the development follows by logical necessity from what went before it. The Nicene Creed is thus logically contained in the Apostles' Creed, and was therefore no addition to the faith of Christendom. But Newman's premises carry him beyond this point. His argument makes it impossible to set any definite limits to the enlargement of the Christian Creed.

Here then we have a temper of mind as earnest, indeed, as Dean Church's in the painful quest of truth, but lacking the Dean's humility, caution, patience, and intellectual conscientiousness. Newman, attracted by his sympathies, jumped to his conclusion, and then sought for arguments with which to justify the process to his own understanding. This was, in effect, to adopt the Catholic faith on rationalistic grounds, and to undermine the foundation of Christianity as an historical religion. Dean Church, on the other hand, combined in a rare degree the historical and critical faculties. His Essay on Dante alone stamps him as one of the first critics of any age; and his volumes on Anselm, Bacon, and "The Beginnings of the Middle Ages," his singularly brilliant and comprehensive sketch of "The Early Ottomans," must make every one who has read them sigh that a mind so powerful, so discriminating, so amply furnished with knowledge, and in command of a style at once so dignified and attractive, did not find time to leave behind him some monumental work on history, in addition to the fragmentary monographs which show how well equipped he was for the task. It was therefore impossible for Dean Church, with his historical instinct and discipline and knowledge, to accept any view of the Church which he could not reconcile with the facts of history. And those facts taught him not to be dismayed or discouraged by the seeming failure of good causes, by the triumph of wicked men, by worldliness and corruption in the high places of the Church. The history of the Church had all along been fulfilling the parable of the drag-net which enclosed good and bad fish alike. The chequered career of the noble Anselm was but a picture of the Church at large in miniature. Her progress is not in a straight line, but zigzag, turning her back sometimes, like the Alpine climber, on the point for which she is making, yet in fact progressing steadily, in spite of appearances, towards her destined goal. "It was her own fault," the Dean tells us, "if the Church gained little by the compromise" extorted from the King by Anselm, and here is the lesson which he finds in the story of the long struggle:

> "In one sense, indeed, what is gained by any great religious movement? What are all reforms, restorations, victories of truth, but protests of a minority; efforts, clogged and incomplete, of the good and brave, just enough in their own day to stop instant ruin—the appointed means to save what is to be saved, but in themselves failures? Good men work and suffer, and bad men enjoy their labours and spoil them; a step is made in advance—evil rolled back and kept in check for a while, only to return perhaps the stronger. But thus, and thus only, is truth passed on and the world preserved from utter corruption. Doubtless bad men still continued powerful in the English Church. Henry tyrannised, evil was done, and the bishops kept silence; low aims and corruptions may still have polluted the very seats of justice; gold may have been as powerful with Cardinals as with King Henry and his Chancellors."

Yet, on the whole, the victory was with Anselm, and so the cause of truth and justice moved on, though slowly, and the good fight has been maintained along the centuries, and will be maintained "till He shall come. to whom alone it is reserved to 'still' forever 'the enemy and the avenger,' and to 'root out all wicked doers from the city of the Lord.'"

It is plain that Dean Church was not the type of English churchman from which converts are made. He saw nothing in the history of the Church of England since the Reformation which had not its analogue in her previous history and in the history of other parts of Christendom at different times. He knew history too well to be carried away by a specious theory, however brilliant, or cast down by a reverse, however formidable at the moment. Had he meditated a step like Newman's, and then felt as Newman did on the eve of his secession, that he would thereby be "undoing his own work"—admittedly a good work—"and leaving the field open, or rather infallibly surrendering it to those who would break down and crumble to powder all religion whatever," he would at once have suspected a flaw in the reasoning which had conducted him to so disastrous a conclusion, and would have remembered St. Paul's warning that it is not right to "do evil that good may come," especially when the evil is certain to affect multitudes, while the good is problematical and reaches to oneself alone.*

To say that Church made an ideal Dean is, in his case, a commonplace. It is not too much to say that he would have dignified and adorned and elevated to an ideal standard any office committed to his charge, from the small village in Somersetshire, where he spent the happiest years of his life, and where his body by his own desire rests, to the Primacy of the English Church, of which he had, or might have had, the refusal. He gave one the impression, more than any man I have ever known, of saintliness, of a life detached from this world and having its roots in the unseen. To him it was an intense reality, not a mere phrase, that "the things which are seen are temporal, and the things which are not seen are eternal." You felt that he judged human conduct in everything by the test of how it would look when death approached. Worldly honours had thus no attraction for him, and he shrank from them, not so much because he feared their alluring temptation, as because his genuine humility made him self-distrustful. It was with the greatest difficulty that Mr. Gladstone at last, aided by the entreaties of others, prevailed on Church to exchange his village home for the deanery of St. Paul's. To him the promotion was a sorrow and a sore trial, and he never ceased to pine for the sweet seclusion, in the midst of rural sights and sounds, where he had disciplined his soul by diversified study and meditation and writing, and, not least, by self-denying labours among the poor of his little flock, after the din and turmoil of Oxford controversy, and the great sorrow of Newman's secession. He seriously wished more than once to resign his deanery, not merely because he sighed for the country, but because he, the ideal Dean, believed himself unfitted for the post. And there came another motive later. He was very anxious to see Dr. Liddon removed from Oxford, both because he saw that Oxford was depressing him unduly, and also because he felt that a man of Liddon's power and unique position should, for the Church's sake and his own, be placed in a position of responsibility. When it became evident, therefore, that Dr. Liddon was not to be a bishop, Dean Church was desirous of making way for him in the deanery of St. Paul's—a sacrifice which friends prevented, and to which Dr. Liddon himself would have been the very last to consent. As some legends have grown round Dr. Liddon's name in connection with bishoprics, there can be no harm now in giving the facts. There is no truth in the rumour that the Queen ever vetoed his nomination to the episcopate. No offer of a particular See was made to him till the year of his death, when he was offered the See of St. Albans. Some years previously, when two Sees happened to be vacant, the Prime Minister of the day begged the Dean of St. Paul's to find out privately whether Liddon would permit his name to be submitted to the Queen. Liddon at once refused, and even declined to take such an offer into his serious consideration. Whether he would have made the same answer had a particular See been offered to him I know not; but I am sure that he would always have refused an offer in the air. I remember his answer to myself when I left Dean Church and himself to decide for me in an offer of preferment which I had refused and been asked to reconsider. "You must remember," he said, "that when a definite offer is made to you it is a distinct call, and that there is therefore as much responsibility in refusing as in accepting it."

---

* "I will never do what I know to be evil, and shrink in fear from what, for aught I can tell, may be good"—*Apology of Socrates*, xvii. 29.

But it was not from moroseness, or fretfulness, or misanthropy, or disappointment, that Dean Church turned his back on the transitory attractions of this world. No man delighted more than he in the innocent enjoyments and amusements of life; no laugh was merrier than his; no eye delighted more in the varied and manifold beauties of Nature, as his writings abundantly show; no one engaged with keener zest and joy in the intellectual interchange and play of good conversation. In his admirable sermons on the "Gifts of Civilisation," he admits that the Church and Civilisation may stand apart as antagonistic forces, but argues that this need not and should not be. He shows how "great moral habits strike their roots deep in a society" even external to the Church.

> "Civilisation has many shapes and means many things. But let us speak fairly, as we know it. Civilisation *to us* means liberty and the power of bearing and using liberty: it means that which ensures to us a peaceful life, a life of our own, fenced in from wrong, and with our paths and ends left free to us; it means the strength of social countenance given on the whole to those virtues which make life nobler and easier; it means growing honor for manliness, unselfishness, sincerity—growing value for gentleness, considerateness, and respect for others; it means readiness to bear criticism, to listen to correction, to see and amend our mistakes; it means the willingness, the passion, to ameliorate conditions, to communicate advantages, to raise the weak and low, to open wide the gates and paths for them to that discipline of cultivation and improvement which has produced such fruit in others more fortunate than they."

In his Lectures (in the same volume) on the great religions of the East, the Dean admits that the high state of human nature, here described, owes much to the overshadowing of the Christian atmosphere which surrounds it, and cannot exist except sporadically, and on a comparatively small scale, outside the frontiers of Christendom. But something is still lacking to it.

> "The heroic mind and the Christian mind are shown not simply in the loss of all things—in giving up this world, in accepting pain and want—but in doing this, if it must be done, for that for which it is worth a man's while to do it; for something of corresponding greatness, though unseen; for truth, for faith, for duty, for the good of others, for a higher life. And this view the words of the New Testament keep continually before us."

It was this life, inculcated and described in the New Testament, that the Dean made the standard of his own life and strove to impress on others. For, highly as he appreciated the gifts of civilisation in all their attractive forms, he saw the peril which lurked in that fascination:

> "We trust that the Christian spirit can live and flourish in society as we know it, different as it is from the first days. But it is clear that as society

> goes on accumulating powers and gifts, the one hope of society is in men's modest and unselfish use of them; in simplicity and nobleness of spirit increasing, as things impossible to our fathers become easy and familiar to us; in men caring for better things than money and ease, and honour; in being able to see the riches of the world [he meant more than gold] increase, and not set our heart's heart upon them; in being able to admire and forego."

Such was his ideal of the Christian life; "using this world as not abusing it." And few men lived up to the ideal as he did. And modest and humble and retiring as he was, his example told; virtue went out of him, and the contagion spread silently, and multitudes felt better for the presence of that spare ascetic figure among them. And they came, a great crowd on a most inclement day, to testify their appreciation and gratitude at his funeral service in St. Paul's Cathedral. It was like him not only to wish to be buried among his old parishioners in the secluded Somersetshire village, but to forbid any kind of memorial to be raised in his honour. He has left behind him, though he thought not of that, a more enduring memorial than marble: feeble knees strengthened, wills braced up to resist temptation, lives purified and blessed by his example. And he has also left behind him another memorial in the transfigured character of the worship and crowded congregations of St. Paul's. He would be the first to disclaim all credit for that transformation; and, indeed, it would be unjust to deny to his colleagues their share in the wonderful improvement. Canons Gregory and Liddon began it before Dean Church's appointment; but they were a minority in the chapter, and without the Dean, moreover, not much could be done; and Dean Mansel's tastes lay in other fields of speculation. On Dean Church's advent things began rapidly to change. Under the old *régime* the Sunday congregation had room enough and to spare in the choir. Soon the space beneath the dome did not suffice to hold the crowds that went to the Cathedral, and when Dr. Liddon preached they extended to the west door. And now the ordinary daily congregation is larger than that which used to assemble on Sunday in the choir. Nor was the influence of the Cathedral confined to London. It spread all over England, and reached even to America and the British colonies, raising the standard of worship among them all. And he who knew least of the source of this great work was the humble scholar and divine at the head of the institution from which it all radiated. It is to be hoped that a successor will be appointed who will carry on the traditions of St. Paul's during the last twenty years.

Let it not be supposed from anything said here about Dean Church's gentleness, humility, and self-effacement, that he was a weak man. He was, indeed, wonderfully tender and affectionate, though he kept his feelings under a disciplined restraint; but he was also not only habitually brave—he could be very stern when the occasion required it. Cruelty, injustice, falseness, always roused his indignation. He had imbibed an ardent love of liberty from his early Italian associations and studies, and from his family connection with Greece;—his uncle, Sir Richard Church, was one of the leaders and heroes of the Greek war of independence. He sympathised with every movement for the liberation and unity of Italy, and for the emancipation of the races still held in Turkish bondage. During the progress of the Eastern struggle in 1877, he wrote in the *Guardian* a series of interesting and instructive articles on the history of the Turks. The Crimean war had previously tempted him to write the most picturesque and most masterly sketch on record—at least within the same compass—of "The Early Ottomans." The same occasion induced Dr. Newman (as he then was) to write his "Lectures on the History of the Turks," where his beautiful style and brilliant powers of generalisation are displayed to advantage.

I may appropriately close this hurried and imperfect sketch with the following quotation from Dean Church's Essay on "The Early Ottomans" as a specimen of his historical style:

> "For twenty years Orchan abstained from conquest, but he was not idle. While the Christian empire beyond the Straits was perishing, he was busy building up a power which was to be ready to take its place, and fit to grasp its heritage. The pastoral horde was becoming a State; the leader of the vagrant camp was taking delight in adorning the temporary capital of his house with the mosques and colleges, the hospitals and caravansaries, the fountains and tombs, which the piety and magnificence of Moslem princes are wont to rear in their royal cities. Brusa was well worth his care. From the last slopes of Olympus it looks over a green plain of woods and meadows; the famous and beautiful mountain, with its forest and its cliffs, overhangs it, and its abundant and ever-flowing waters—the warm, medicinal springs which well out beneath the baths of the city, and the cold, sparkling sources streaming down from above, among its rocks and its plane-trees—have made Brusa famous among Eastern cities. Not less famous is it for the choice excellence of its trees and fruits, its grapes and apricots, its chestnuts, each of forty drachms weight, and its forty kinds of pears. The sheep in its pastures produced the

finest wool, its mulberry-trees the finest silk, and drew to it craftsmen, who made the work of their looms, their scarfs, and embroidered stuffs, their lawn, and their samit, renowned almost to our own day. Before the Ottomans appeared, Christian monasteries had gleamed among the woods of Olympus, or nestled in its folds; the hermit's cell had been hung on its precipices, or perched upon its crests, or hid within its caverns. Their place was taken by the dervishes and the santons, on whom Orchan bestowed his largesses with liberal hand; and Olympus became a holy mountain, sanctified by their retreats while living, and by their sepulchres in death. Among them, also, were the earlier poets and theologians of the Ottomans, who loved the stillness and the shade of the murmuring pines. There they could lie and look down on the glittering city and sunny plain below. The city of Orchan's choice had all that could make it dear to Moslems and Orientals; it was a worthy home for the last conquerors of Islam to depart from, and return to, in their wars, and to rest in during the days of peace. Here the first six sultans kept their court, and here they lie buried in stately tombs near the mosques which they founded. Round them are the sepulchres of their children and brothers; and these are encompassed on all sides by the resting-places and memorials of the great men of the rising State, its first viziers and lieutenants; and further, about the mausoleums of the early sultans and saints of the Empire are grouped some five hundred tombs of famous men—pashas, scheikhs, professors, orators, physicians, poets, musicians. Thus gifted and adorned by Nature, and consecrated by so many recollections and such venerable monuments, Brusa rivals Adrianople in dignity and Bagdad in holiness, and still, when the sultan's style and title is proclaimed, it is named as the third city of his Empire."

THE LATE DEAN CHURCH.

BY THE REV. JULIUS H. WARD.

From *The Christian Union*, New York, January 1, 1891.

The Very Rev. R. W. Church was born in 1815, and was a little over seventy-five years of age at his death. He had been the Dean of St. Paul's since 1871, receiving the appointment to that unique and influential position after the death of Dean Mansel, who received his appointment on the death of Dean Milman. He had been the rector of Whatley parish for a much longer time, and in his earlier life had been one of the younger Fellows of Oriel College, Oxford, at the time when John Henry Newman was in the height of his fame and influence as a leader in the Oxford Movement, which was intended to revive the Catholic life of the Church of England, and to restore the Catholic spirit and ritual which had been lost during the stormy periods that had intervened since the English Reformation was begun. He was one of the young men in 1840 whom Newman profoundly influenced, but was too thoroughly identified with the Church of England to follow Newman to Rome. He was never a controversialist, and when Newman left Oxford he had no part in the infuriated persecution which led to the condemnation of Tract 90 and indicated to its author that there was no further place for him in the Anglican Church. So close was the intimacy between him and Dr. Newman that the changes of the latter did not break a friendship which was maintained with the greatest heartiness and freedom down to the death of the Cardinal, and which led him, as often as he visited London, to be the guest of Dr. Church at St. Paul's Deanery rather than accept the hospitality offered to him at the palace of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. When the correspondence between the Cardinal and Dean Church shall be published, it is likely to reveal much that is beautiful and noble in the lives of both, and it is no secret to say that the friendship between these two men was on a plane of spiritual communion which was entirely above the questions or points at issue between the Roman and the Anglican Churches. Cardinal Newman maintained a great many of his Anglican friendships unbroken after he had changed his faith, and it is understood that his relations with Dean Church were more intimate than those with almost any other of his Anglican friends.

St. Paul's Cathedral, London, has always had the choicest and in some respects the most representative men among the English clergy as its deans, but the last three incumbents have been men fit to rank with the very foremost of their predecessors. Dean Milman, the author of "Latin Christianity," was the rival of Lord Macaulay in point of learning, and was one of the greatest scholars of his time, never taking up any subject which he did not illustrate or adorn, and handling a work like Newman's treatise on "The Development of Christian Doctrine" as readily as he wrote a paper on "Savonarola" or "Erasmus." Dean Mansel was the author of the Bampton Lectures for 1858, on "The Limits of Religious Thought," from which Mr. Herbert Spencer derived his philosophy of the Unknowable, and was one of the greatest wits and clearest thinkers of his time. He was five years the junior of Dean Church, and maintained the prestige of St. Paul's on the lines which Dean Milman had laid down. With the appointment of Dr. Church to this commanding position there came a change. It was at this time that a great stir had been made in England over the condition of the old cathedrals, and Dean Church, who had been the exponent with Dr. Pusey and the late Canon Liddon of what was best in the Oxford Movement, determined to revive St. Paul's and make it, so far as possible, as a center of spiritual activity, what the late Dean Stanley had begun to make Westminster Abbey as the center of the historical life of the English Church and nation. He succeeded in this enterprise. St. Paul's became under his direction a great and abiding influence in the heart of London, appealing through its increased services and organized work to great numbers of people in the heart of a city, and reaching through its great preachers, like Canon Liddon and Canon Scott Holland, thousands of people who had never thought of attending St. Paul's at any time before he became its Dean. The strongest and ablest preachers in England were constantly invited to the Cathedral pulpit, and its magnificent services and strong preaching have done more to revive the use of the English cathedrals than any other single agency. Canon Liddon felt that his best work was done in the pulpit of St. Paul's, and Dean Church was the moving impulse and controlling influence in all this progress and development. It was a silent, quiet, but effective renewal of many of the Cathedral ministrations which were within the reach of these central churches in the days before the Reformation; but Dean Church was not a mediævalist, and his object was rather to increase the efficiency of St. Paul's as a great modern church of the people than to restore the spiritual pageantry of a bygone age.

Dean Church was not a preacher in the sense that Canon Liddon was, but his sermons will be read as classics in English literature when Canon Liddon's are forgotten. They rank with those of Cardinal Newman in point of style, and are remarkable for the combination of culture with spiritual insight. They are no more, seemingly, great sermons than are those of Cardinal Newman, but the reader of them is surprised, as he is in Cardinal Newman's, by the visions of truth and the new relations in which truth stands to life that are flashed upon him in these unassuming discourses. The author seems to have seen things from the center, and the comprehensiveness of his ethical and spiritual views is a constant surprise. He is great in his thought, in the flashes of light that he throws upon dark things, in the way in which he sees truth as a whole, and in his mastery of a style which the simplest can understand, and which opens the way to truths which the most profound cannot fully exhaust. His sermons are everywhere quoted by the brightest and most thoughtful writers of the day, and his lecture-sermons, which grew out of his partly secular work at St. Paul's, and discussed sacred poetry and the relation of Christianity to races, are among the finest examples in our literature of the true way in which to trace the religious movement of mankind. He was always the master of the subjects which he treated. In 1850 he contributed to the *Christian Remembrancer* a critical article more than a hundred pages in length, which has held its own, amid all that has been written during the last forty years, as the most appreciative and comprehensive introduction to Dante and his work that has ever been written in English. This essay has gone through many editions, and his other occasional essays have had almost a similar popularity. An essay on Wordsworth stands in merit beside the late Matthew Arnold's study of that poet, and his papers on Browning's "Sordello" and the celebrated essay on "Montaigne" are masterpieces in literary discrimination. He was equally strong in a masterly essay on "Church and State," published in 1850, and republished in 1881. Three prose monographs indicate what he could do in the field of history and critical biography. His "Saint Anselm" is the best work on that spiritual leader of the eleventh century, and his monographs on "Bacon" and "Spenser" are masterly studies of their kind. He had the ability to speak the right word on every subject to which he gave his thought, and his writings, though not large in bulk, have by general consent already been accepted as a permanent part of English literature. His monograph on "Bacon" is regarded as the fairest and most reasonable estimate of the father of the inductive philosophy, and his essay on "Richard Hooker," which is published as an introduction to the study of his "Ecclesiastical Polity," is a remarkable presentation of the claims of Hooker upon the literary student of to-day. He had a genius for the finest literary work, and his mind was continually in sympathy with the writings of the great masters of the imagination. It is said that when Mr. Gladstone had the naming of the next Archbishop of Canterbury, he inquired of the Dean of St. Paul's what his answer would be if the "primatial see" were offered to him. Dr. Church immediately replied, "I should decline it." This indicates what Mr. Gladstone's opinion was of Dean Church as a leader in ecclesiastical affairs. It is said that he was one of the frequent editorial writers in the *Guardian,* which is the principal organ of the Church of England, and it is doubted if there was any other clergyman in England during the last forty years of his life who figured so little in public affairs and yet exerted so great an influence through his control of the springs of power. It is difficult, in our distance from him, to understand the weight which he carried in ecclesiastical directions. He was one of the most modest and unassuming men to be found in England, never physically strong, not a man of distinguished presence, but one whose life corresponded with his thinking, and whose writings are the mirror in which we see into his inmost thought. He was one of the quietest and humblest among the really great men of the English Church during the last half-century, and was the best exponent in literature of the Catholic spirit in the Oxford Movement, a volume of reminiscences on which was the last work which he had in hand, and which is supposed to have been finished only a few days before his lamented death.

ZÖCKLER'S STATISTICS OF CHRISTIANITY.

From *The Independent,* New York, January 8, 1891.

In Zöckler's "*Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften,*" Vol. III., the editor has published what is evidently the result of a careful collection of statistics and data from all the ends and corners of Christianity. As he has drawn, in not a few cases, from sources not accessible to American Church statisticians, a brief *résumé* of his figures will not be unacceptable. He has four tables, one of Church statistics according to nations; a second of the growth of Protestantism as compared with that of Roman Catholicism; a third on Church governments and the clergy; a fourth on the Confessional statistics of Europe and America.

Of Orthodox or Eastern Christians there are 87,000,000, of whom 76,000,000 are regular adherents in Russia, Greece, the Balkan countries and Turkey, and 11,000,000 are Russian sects. The total number of adherents of Oriental churches is 4,200,000—namely, Nestorians, 400,000; Armenians, 2,300,000; Jacobites, 1,500,000. There are 205,000,000 Roman Catholics, 4,480,000 Orthodox Greeks connected with Rome, with 520,000 Maronites, Thomas Christians and others. The total number of Orientals is thus nearly 92,000,000, of Roman Catholics 210,000,000, while Protestants number 150,000,000. Of the last mentioned 47,000,000 are Lutherans, 25,500,000 Presbyterians and Independents (Congregationalists), 24,000,000 Episcopalians, 33,625,000 Methodists, Baptists and smaller denominations. The total number of Christians is 452,000,000.

The growth of the Churches is encouraging to Protestants. In 1786 the number of Protestants in Europe was 37,000,000; of Roman Catholics, 80,000,000; of the Greek Church, 40,000,000. In 1886 the number of Protestants was 85,000,000, of Roman Catholics, 154,000,000, of the Greeks, 83,000,000, showing a Protestant increase in this century of 230 per cent, a Roman Catholic of 192 and Greek of 207. In 1786 the number of Protestants in North America was computed at 2,700,000; of Roman Catholics at 190,000. One hundred years later the former numbered 47,000,000, the latter about 19,930,000, an increase of 1,741 per cent in the former case, of 1,049 in the latter. Missionary statistics show similar facts. In 1790 the total number of Roman Catholic converts from heathendom was computed at 1,325,000; of Protestants, 30,000. Now the former number 2,426,000, the latter 915,000; the former have thus scarcely doubled their successes, the latter report twenty times the number of their converts a century ago.

The government of the Orthodox Church is divided according to countries. In the Turkish Empire there are 4 patriarchates—namely, that of Constantinople with 80 subordinate archbishoprics and bishoprics; Antiochia, with 15; Jerusalem, with 8; and Alexandria with 1. In Hellas there are 11 archbishops and 13 bishops. In Roumania. Bulgaria and Servia there are 4 metropolitan bishops. In the Russian Empire there are 58 exarchies under control of the Holy Synod. The secular clergy number about 100,000, the monks 10,512, the nuns 14,574. The total number of higher dignitaries in the regular Oriental Church is thus 190. The Nestorians have 2 patriarchs with many subordinate metropolitan bishops and others. The Thomas Christians have only priests. Of the Monophysites, the Armenians (*i. e.,* the non-United) have 1 catholicos and more than 100 bishops (the United Armenians having 2 patriarchs); the Syrian Jacobites, 1 patriarch, 1 primos and 12 bishops; the Coptic Church has 1 patriarch and 12 bishops in Egypt and 1 abuna, 1 prior and 7 bishops in Abyssinia. The Maronites, nominally connected with Rome, have 8 regular bishops and a number *in partibus.*

The Roman Catholics have 72 cardinals, 74 patriarchs, 161 archbishops of the Latin rite, and 22 of the Oriental, making a total of 183. Of the bishoprics of the Latin rite, 86 are called "exempt"—*i. e.*, are directly controlled by the Pope; 595 are suffragans, and 56 are of the Oriental rite, making a total of 737. There are 18 higher prelates without dioceses, making the total membership of the hierarchy 1084. In addition to these there are 7 apostolic delegations, 108 apostolic vicariates, 35 apostolic prefectures—these three being mission offices—the sum of all hierarchical titles being thus 1234. In the Established Church of England the number of hierarchical offices is 124; in the United States the Episcopal Church numbers 69 bishops. The Lutheran Church has a hierarchical form of government only in the Scandinavian lands. Sweden has 1 archbishop and 11 bishops; Norway has 6 bishops; Denmark, including Iceland, 8, and Finland 1 archbishop and 2 bishops. In Germany the Lutheran Churches are governed by consistory, there being one for every country or province, thus making about fifty in all. In France, Hungary, Austria, Holland and elsewhere a similar organization exists. In North America and Austria synods have been organized and the congregational system prevails, the synods having no legislative or judicial, but only advisory powers.

THE IMPERIAL DIET OF JAPAN.

BY WILLIAM IMBRIE, D.D.

From *The Interior* (Presbyterian), December 25, 1890.

"In accordance with Acts 7 and 14 of the Constitution, the members of the Imperial Diet are hereby convoked to meet in Tokyo on the 25th of November next."

This decree, signed by the Emperor and countersigned by the ten Ministers of State, was issued on the 9th of October. At the time appointed the two Houses of the Diet assembled. The streets in the neighborhood were filled with a large but undemonstrative crowd. The weather was charming—the perfection of autumn. The business transacted by the House of Peers was of little interest. The event of the day was the nomination to the Emperor by the House of Representatives of candidates for the offices of President and Vice-President. After a session of more than twelve hours, this was accomplished; and on the day following the Emperor appointed the nominees who had received the highest number of votes. These were Messrs. Nakashima and Tsuda. It is a fact worthy of note that the President, Mr. Nakashima, is a Christian. For a number of years he has been a member of the United Church.

The formal opening of the Diet by the Emperor did not take place until the 29th. At precisely 10.30 in the morning, the procession started from the palace to the Houses of Parliament. Five thousand troops were under arms, drawn up along the route. The escort was a detachment of the Imperial Guard. At the head of the procession, with only a company of lancers in advance, came members of the Imperial family. In the rear followed high officials and grand dignitaries of the Empire. In the center rode the Emperor in the phœnix carriage of State, attended by footmen gorgeous in gold lace. The procession moved slowly. The crowd back of the lines of troops was a dense mass. From time to time a cheer broke forth. But the Japanese cheer is feeble. The ringing shout of an English crowd is a thing of the future.

The Emperor reached the House of Peers at 11 o'clock. At 11.15 the Peers entered the assembly hall, arrayed for the most part in blue and gold. These were followed by the members of the House of Representatives, with two exceptions, in somber citizen's dress. Next entered the Ministers of State, who took their places below the throne. Then came the Emperor and the Imperial train. In the presence of the Emperor, Peers and Representatives bowed low. Count Yamagata, Minister President of State, presented to his Majesty a scroll on which was written the Imperial message. The Emperor received it and read it aloud in a clear voice:

"We announce to the members of the House of Peers and to those of the House of Representatives: That all institutions relating to internal administration, established during the period of twenty years since our accession to the throne, have been brought to a state approaching completeness and regular arrangement. By the efficacy of the virtues of our ancestors, and in concert with yourselves, we hope to continue and extend those measures, to reap good fruits from the working of the constitution, and thereby to manifest both at home and abroad the glory of our country and the loyal and enterprising character of our people. We have always cherished a resolve to maintain friendly relations with other countries, to develop commerce, and to extend the prestige of our land. Happily our relations with all the treaty powers are on a footing of constantly growing amity and intimacy. In order to preserve tranquillity at home and security from abroad, it is essential that the completion of our naval and military defences should be made an object of gradual attainment. We shall direct our Ministers of State to submit to the Diet the budget for the twenty-fourth year of Meiji, and certain projects of laws. We expect that you will deliberate and advise upon them with impartiality and discretion ; and we trust that you will establish such precedents as may serve for future guidance."

Having read his message, the Emperor handed it to the Count Ito, President of the House of Peers. He then withdrew and returned to the palace. By common consent the whole ceremony was performed with a propriety and a dignity becoming the occasion.

At this time, when the ship of State is slowly going about and her sails are just beginning to fill for a new course through calm and storm, one can hardly suppress a word concerning the winds and the currents that have borne her thus far on her way. What are the chief forces that have co-operated in the evolution of the Imperial Diet of Japan? I recently put this question to an exceptionally well informed and most thoughtful Japanese friend. His reply was in substance as follows :

The first thing never to be forgotten is the example of England and America. The impression made by those countries upon the Japanese who visited them during the years following the opening of Japan was most profound. This personal observation was followed by a wide dissemination of foreign literature and foreign ideas. The man above others to whom this was due is Fukuzawa. He established his celebrated school in Tokyo. He issued pamphlet after pamphlet. The first sentence in one of these well sets forth the doctrine which he preached : " Heaven never made man above man : all men are equal." By him more than by any other were the people first made familiar with the idea of constitutional government.

A second force to be remembered is that of the company of men commonly described as the Liberals. Chief among these must be named Itagaki. Itagaki lacks the constructive power essential to a statesman, but it is impossible to deny that his influence and work have been very great. He was one of the seven who signed the original memorial to the Emperor, praying for the establishment of a Diet. It was he who adopted the method of popular agitation. In a vague way the government talked of a Diet at some time in the future, but it did nothing whatever to prepare the way for it. Its policy was always restrictive and oppressive. Its schoolmaster was Bismarck. Itagaki, on the other hand, gave himself to the cause. He went hither and thither, endeavoring to inspire the people with the spirit of liberty. He did everything in his power, until he was compelled to silence by the stringent laws of the Government regarding the press and public assemblies. To him especially was due the organization of the old Liberal Party ; and no one may claim a greater share in the pressure of public opinion, which finally led the Emperor to promise a constitutional government in 1890. It is said that his first thought was to employ the doctrine of liberty as a lever to overturn the Sat-Cho combination. That may be true. But it is likewise undeniable that at a very early period he was inspired with a sincere and deep love of liberty for her own sake. The words which he uttered as he fell almost fatally wounded by the sword of an assassin, " You may kill me, but you cannot kill liberty"—words since echoed over Japan —are a fair expression of his ruling passion.

An intelligent student of Japanese history will not omit mention of a third force. In old times the Emperor was everything. The first step was the extension of power to an aristocracy—the family of Fujiwara. Then came the feudal system—the times of the Daimyos. Now there is a still wider extension of power—all those possessed of a certain amount of property are granted a voice in the administration of affairs. Any account of the evolution of the Diet that fails to notice this tendency is only superficial. It sees the winds and the waves, but is blind to the tide. There is a tide in history as truly as there is a tide in the ocean. Both alike are silent ; are caused alike by unseen heavenly powers and are resistless. The tide is flowing in Europe. For centuries it has been slowly flowing in Japan. The same tide—the tide that is moving on to democracy.

Turning now from the past to the present. Into what parties are the members of the Diet divided? One listening to the Japanese conversation upon the question speedily discovers that reference is comparatively seldom made to the Upper House. Interest centers in the House of Representatives. This is not because there are no divisions in the House of Peers. Rumor reports them so sharp that they are manifest even at private entertainments. But for the most part they are not on party lines. The Peers are agitated rather by questions of rank and wealth. But doubtless the chief reason of the scant attention given to the Upper House at present is the obvious fact that the Lower House is the House of and for the people. Speaking briefly and somewhat broadly, the members of the House of Representatives may be divided into four classes:

(1) There is a company of Independents who decline for the present to connect themselves with any party.

(2) There is the National Liberal Party (Kokumin Jiyu To). Some four or five years ago a cry was raised against what was called the Europeanizing Principle. The objection was not to the material products of western civilization—the railways, telegraphs, ironclads, etc.; but to its social customs, its systems of law, its religion. The watchword was, "Revere History. Maintain the life of Old Japan." The National Party represents these sentiments. It is, therefore, anti-foreign and anti-Christian. The party is extremely heterogeneous in its elements. Still, it may have a future. It numbers among its adherents some of the shrewdest politicians in Japan. But at present it occupies a secondary place in public interest.

(3) There is the Progressive Party (Kaishin To). The agitation of the old Liberal Party gave to Count Okuma the opportunity of a politician. His own position in the government was at the time unstable. He obtained an interview with the Emperor, and received his promise that this year should see the convocation of a Parliament. Okuma then retired and formed the Progressive Party. It was a shrewd attempt to take the wind out of the sails of the Liberals. This party has always been rich in orators; and in general its reputation has been for talking rather than for doing. Its principles do not differ essentially from those of the Liberals. The differences between the two are almost wholly personal or sentimental. Repeated efforts have therefore been made to unite both in a single party. These efforts have thus far failed to accomplish that object. But while the parties have not yet been brought to the point of union, they have agreed upon co operation in the Diet. This is just now the fact of special interest in Japanese politics.

(4) There is the Constitutional Liberal Party (Rikken Jiyu To). This is the successor of the old Liberal Party—the party that has always stood for a constitutional government. Its reorganization was described in a recent letter to the *Interior*. Suffice to add that it is not only the successor of the old Liberal Party, but that it is also the inheritor of its traditions and honors. It goes without saying that its most distinguished member is Itagaki. What is the significance of these facts? The Liberals and the Progressives together constitute the majority of the Diet. The outlook therefore is that the Diet may be counted on for an endeavor to work on Liberal lines. This raises the question of the immediate future, What are the questions likely to be brought before the Diet by the Liberal Party?

The *Jiyu Shimbun* (the organ of the Liberals) has recently published a long list of subjects which it states are to be embodied in measures to be submitted to the Diet. The following are among those of the greatest general interest.

(1) The reduction of the land tax one-half of one per cent. This, it is said, will amount to a reduction in the revenue of about five million dollars annually. The claim is that the land tax is relatively far too high.

(2) Reform in the Press Laws. At present copies of all publications must be submitted to the authorities. This often occasions much delay and great inconvenience. Newspapers may not publish a memorial to the government. They are suspended sometimes one hardly knows why. It is not claimed that the Press Laws should be abolished, but it is claimed that they are oppressive and should be modified.

(3) Reform in the laws regulating public meetings. As in the case of the Press Laws, it is not insisted that there should be no laws regulating assemblies. On the contrary, it is right and to be desired that all necessary provision be made for the due preservation of order. Nor is there any objection to a rule that reasonable notice—say twenty-four hours—be sent to the police. But objection is made to such regulations as these: All political meetings must be reported to the police four days in advance. The subjects of the addresses cannot be advertised in the newspapers, or posted on the outside of the building in which the meeting is held. A speaker may criticise any political party with all freedom. If he criticises the Government he must pay for the privilege.

(4) Limitation of the powers of the Government in various directions. For example: The removal of the university and all public schools from its direct control. The

correction of the evil of granting subsidise to private enterprises. The abolition of the Peace Preservation Regulations—the edict by which the Government compels persons not convicted of crime to retire from the capital.

(5) The extension of the electoral franchise and the increase of representation in the House of Representatives.

(6) Prison reform. This point is not included in the programme published in the *Jiyu Shimbun*, but it is under consideration. It is a common impression that Japanese prisons may fairly be compared with prisons in America. They are sometimes described as models. Mr. Kataoka, a member of the Diet, a gentleman beyond contention and an elder in the church at Kochi, assures me that this impression is quite erroneous. Not long ago he himself spent nearly a year in prison for a political offence. His experience was as follows: The food is scant and wretched. Prisoners are allowed clothing barely sufficient to cover them; not sufficient to keep them warm. The fact that one comes from the south and that the prison is in the north makes no difference. Little consideration is shown in sickness. During the long winter nights the prisoners lie awake hour after hour in cold and hunger, unable to sleep for the ceaseless tramp of the guard in the hall. Worse than these things is the tyranny of the jailers. No prisoner may address a jailer without prostrating himself on the ground. The slightest offense, real or imaginary, is punished by beating. In one case at least beating was the indirect cause of death. This is not the impression carried away by foreigners who visit the prisons; for pains are taken that they shall carry away a different impression. On the other hand, one should not suppose that Japanese prisons can compete in horrors with the prisons in Russia. But there is ample room for reform.

(7) Revision of the treaties. On this question there is now said to be a difference of opinion among the Liberals. Some regard the control of the tariff as the chief point, and would be willing to let the matter of jurisdiction over foreign residents rest for the present as something sentimental rather than serious. Others take precisely the opposite view. To them the present position of foreigners as amenable only to their own consuls is intolerable. The honor of the nation is involved. According to the latest reports, this will be the position of the party as a party. But it is not unlikely that both points will be insisted upon. A leading member of the party recently said to me: "The Liberals are content to wait for five years in order to allow full time for foreigners to adjust themselves to the change. But at the end of that time they will be satisfied with nothing short of the control of the tariff and the abolition of consular jurisdiction." To the question, "Will foreigners then be allowed to acquire and hold property throughout the country?" the answer was, "Under such restrictions as shall be necessary for the protection of Japanese interests."

And what are the thoughts of the people under constitutional government? Probably the masses hardly know what to think. The newspapers, it need scarcely be said, talk of nothing else. But what are the feelings of the men who have waited long and suffered not a little that this day might come? Such a man is Mr. Kataoka, the gentlemen to whom I have already referred, and for years a right arm to Itagaki. As nearly as I can recall them, these are the concluding words of a long conversation with which he recently favored me:

"No doubt it will seem somewhat presuming to compare the two. But I never read the story of the Exodus and the journeyings of the children of Israel to the banks of the Jordan, and think of the long road which we have traveled to constitutional government in Japan, without finding a host of analogies. When Itagaki withdrew from a place in the Government, it was rejecting the wealth of Egypt and choosing rather affliction with the nation. The first thought of all of us was that the land of Canaan was not far off; but we have found the path long, and it has led us through a great and terrible wilderness. Face to face with difficulties and dangers, many repented of their choice and in heart returned into Egypt. Some complained that they had been deceived, and were angry and murmured. Some early gave up all hope, but others have ever been strong in faith. Of many it is true that they died in the wilderness, and that only their children shall cross to the other side of the Jordan. Nor is the work yet done. There are still cities high and fenced to heaven. But we have now reached the brink of the river, and we shall go over it in faith."

TOKYO, JAPAN.

IF you think that the teachings of Jesus have been outlived, try to live them out.—*Christian Register.*

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS IN OUR TIME.

BY RICHARD S. STORRS, D.D., LL.D.

From *The Sunday-School Times*, Philadelphia, December 27, 1890.

THE command given long ago is still as imperative for all who own allegiance to Christ as it was at the beginning; it will continue to be so till all shall have heard the Divine message, and there shall be no more call or room for its fresh preaching. And it is one of the astonishing facts in the progress of modern thought, that, after the vast missionary successes of the early disciples, and of those who have followed them, down to our day, there remains still, here and there, a doubt, even among those who call themselves Christians, whether the lesser and lighter work yet remaining can be performed; whether it is possible, even in our day, to preach the gospel to every creature—to make disciples of all the nations. The apostles might almost have been pardoned if they had hesitated before a command so staggering as this to human prudence. But surely we are fools and blind if we draw back in timid unbelief; since the nations are now physically accessible, all over the world, as then they were not. The earth is so knit together that it might almost be said to be diminished in physical bulk, by steamships, railways, lines of telegraph, the explorations and expansions of commerce. Its most distant parts are practically nearer to us to-day than the confines of the empire were in Paul's day to Rome. Japan and China are not as remote as Britain then was from the palaces on the Tiber. India is an English dependency; Egypt, a European suburb; Africa is being brought into the light of general knowledge, in all its extent, with a rapidity proportioned to the depth of the darkness in which it has lain; the islands of the Pacific are within easy reach from American shores. There is a supreme moral meaning in modern machineries. They came contemporaneously with the wide uprising of the missionary spirit, and came to be its ministers—the swifter wheels for its advance, the silver trumpets for its Divine tidings.

There is now, too, a surpassing weight and majesty in the appeal of the gospel which never before appeared so fully, not only in its address to individuals, but to peoples. It has now a Christian civilization behind it, such as the old world knew nothing about—hundreds of years of what has been, on the whole, an impressive, an illustrious history. The gospel is not henceforth in words alone, in letters, sermons, even treatises and volumes. It is in great civilized states, whose fame is familiar throughout the world; it pervades large parts of the noblest modern literature; it is in arts of beauty, and in useful inventions; in governments at once popular and strong, in multitudinous institutes of learning and of charity, in millions of churches, and tens of millions of happy, cultured, and prosperous homes. It sets its impress on statute-books, and makes laws more humane. It helps the poor, and heals the sick, and gives sight to the blind, as did the Master. It carries education into humblest hamlets, and it fronts tyranny, on whatever coast, or legalized crime wherever it exists, with a voice of command like that of the Lord, and with sure expectation of victory to come. Therefore the nations are more ready to receive it than ever before; because they see, and cannot but see, the secular benefits which march in its train. They want what it has done for others to be done by it for themselves; and whether its doctrines and precepts suit them or not—though these continue as offensive to them as aforetime they were to Roman and to Jew—the peoples of the world feel, as Darwin did, that "the lesson of the missionary is the enchanter's wand," and they want that wand to start liberty, education, popular advancement among themselves; to turn the coal into color and power, to transform iron into steel, and to make electricity the servant of man. There is no mistaking this vast new trend in the attitude of the unevangelized world toward the Gospel of Christ. It may want this for its effects, rather than for itself; but those effects shine before it, quickening desire, alluring hope, as a sovereign prize.

At just this point there appears also, as almost might have been expected, another combination of cosmical forces reminding one of that in which Roman power and law went with Greek speech around the world. The interdependence of distant peoples was never before so close as now; and the outreach of the commerce and of the languages of Protestant nations was never so vast. Not mere isolated points are now accessible to the Master's message. The whole world is open to it—dusky continents and cannibal islands, lands newly discovered, and lands of ancient and proud renown. It may be almost literally said that there is no people, or part of a people, no tribe or fraction of a tribe, to which may not be carried at once the angels' song, with the transfiguring story which follows. The habitations of cruelty have seen a new light, remotest coral-reefs watch for the mission-ship, Ethiopia stretches her hands unto God.

So such successes are realized now as have not been paralleled since the early days of missions. Standing in the vestibule, the house is not altogether in our view. Standing in one city-street the whole splendid and populous area is not before us; and figures as yet cannot fully set forth what has been achieved since the oldest American missionary society found birth and being, eighty years ago. But it is something, certainly, that American missions alone now occupy more than four thousand stations in unevangelized lands, with twenty-three hundred and fifty missionaries sent from this country, and more than ten thousand native helpers; that there are at these stations more than twenty-seven hundred churches, with nearly two hundred and thirty seven thousand communicants, of whom twenty-six thousand were added last year; and that four millions of dollars are contributed annually in our country to carry on the work. It is something, certainly, that all Protestant missionary societies have now forty-six thousand missionaries and helpers in the field, ministering to nearly seven hundred thousand communicants, and to more than three millions of adherents to Christianity, and expending every year at least twelve millions of dollars in the distant and costly work.

These aggregates are already large, while they become more significant when we add the schools, seminaries, hospitals, printing establishments, which have sprung up on all sides in the path of Christian missions. But a yet more animating fact is the fact that the ratio of increase in the added communicants is steadily rising, and that only limitation of means for the work forbids or hinders the opening of new areas for the preaching of the truth on every hand, in many lands. He who doubts about the success of Christian missions, under the light of the last eighty years, may doubt if steamships will ever reach England because they sweep down the bay with accelerating speed; may doubt if a building will ever be erected because as yet only the lower stories have rapidly risen upon the immense and firm foundations. It is a childish folly which doubts, not an experienced practical wisdom. A hundred years hence—perhaps another eighty years—will see the world generally Christianized, if the courage and enterprise of Christian disciples are at all a match for their great opportunity.

Here then appears the immense and pressing duty of our time; pressing as the inexorable movement of the years, urgent as the moral and social need of mankind, superlative as the nature and work of the Lord! Here appears, too, our noblest privilege—the privilege of taking part in this majestic cosmical enterprise; of following in the line of those whose faith, consecration, and holy heroism, have built Christendom, and have made the religion which to human eyes came out of Galilee familiar in its name, and in many of its principles, wherever thought has language for its vehicle; the privilege of coming to such fellowship with the Master as cannot be reached in song or sacrament, or in even the uplift and ecstasy of prayer. We touch his mighty and tender hand as nowhere else, when we are doing his work in the world. We come nearer to him here than we can elsewhere until we see him face to face; and many a distant missionary home, remote from civilization, planted amid an earthly darkness dense enough to be felt, is radiant with his manifest presence as the costliest chapel or the proudest cathedral never is. In this work we touch the future of the world, and put elements and forces into its history which shall be springing to their results long after the very stones at our graves shall have crumbled into dust. Every strong spirit must sympathize with that desire of a perennial usefulness in the world which survived the hope of personal immortality in the mind of her in whose career brilliance and sadness, power and pathos, so strangely mingled — the author of "Romola." Through missions for the gospel we realize the hope, and make the coming ages bright. It is the province of civilization to conquer and re-fashion the physical earth, as it is widely, magnificently doing, making wastes to bloom, abolishing mountains as barriers to intercourse, irrigating deserts, conquering seas, setting village and city amid the encircling loveliness of landscape. The gospel is for every created thing, and the earth arrays itself in new garments before it.

But the primary and pre-eminent office of that gospel, and of the churches which make world wide the knowledge of it, is morally to renew the race of mankind to which the earth has been committed, and so to build on the globe that ultimate, resplendent city of God which shall link the earth with spheres celestial, having come down out of heaven from God! No other work can be conceived so vital and so noble as that! There can be no other the remembrance of which shall be to us so beautiful and dear when we stand—if we may—with apostles and martyrs, and with the redeeming Son of God, in worlds of light.

For this is needed more than anything else, the temper of utter consecration—which gives money gladly and vastly ; which gives life, with that utter unreserve which marks the highest reach and royalty of the devoted human soul. Men and women not unfrequently appear, who are willing to go to Japan, perhaps, and to work on the field of that strange civilization ; who are willing, possibly, to go to China or India, or into famous Syrian districts. All honor to such ! Oftentimes their help is greatly needed, and is most effective. But Paul was as ready to go to the rude peoples of Lycaonia as to the sumptuous and profligate Corinth ; to the lawless and gluttonous liars of Crete as to the stoic and epicurean philosophers in the city of the violet crown. It will not be till his temper is common among the energetic and strong in our churches, and especially among the young, that the Master's command will be fulfilled, and the world in its entire compass will have heard the words of eternal life. Livingstone counted it a privilege, not a sacrifice, to have spent so much of his life in Africa ; and that is the spirit of which the promised millennium shall show itself the predestined outcome !

THE ELECTIONS IN JAPAN IN RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY.

From *The Independent* (London), December 19, 1890.

From a private letter we condense the following :—In July last the election of the first Japanese Parliament took place. Out of a population of 39,383,263, the qualified voters were 450,365, or about one in 87. The number who did not vote was 27,636, an average of six per cent. Owing to some irregularity 2823 votes did not count. Thus, out of every hundred votes 94 went to the poll—" a remarkable evidence," says our correspondent, " of the interest felt in the election. Each voter must be twenty-five years of age, and pay an annual tax of 15 yen (about £3). . . . No feature of the election has been more interesting than its relation to Christianity, and no event more clearly indicates the rising influence of the young Church of Christ in Japan. It is said that before the election in many centres the worst thing that could be brought against a candidate was that he was a Christian. So strongly was this felt that not a few who were approvers of Christianity were impelled to declare publicly that they were not Christians. One church-member, under this pressure, so trimmed his Christianity as to practically put himself outside of the Church ; others stood with heroic firmness. In one district, in pressing a Christian to be a candidate, the voters said, 'Better give up your Christianity.' 'I would rather be a Christian than a candidate,' was his reply. 'But you are an office-bearer, and as the Constitution prohibits religious *teachers* from election, you may be regarded by some as a teacher, and so lose your election. Give up your office.' 'No,' he said, 'I can't do that : to be an officer of the Church of Christ is more pleasure to me than to be a member of the National Diet.' He stood firm against all such appeals, and he lost nothing by his firmness, for he went in with a good majority. From, . . . the centre and stronghold of Buddhism in Japan a Christian representative has been sent, and it is estimated that there will be not less than thirteen Christians, all of whom are in the first rank, and it is not at all unlikely that one of these will be the first Premier."

CHRISTIANITY IN THE HOME.

BY THEODORE L. CUYLER, D.D.

From *The Christian at Work*, January 15, 1891.

No two words have a more vital importance than Christianity and Home. Underneath the foundations of both Church and State lies the household ; it is older also than either of them. There is no such school of Bible-religion in the land as a happy God-fearing home. No church is effective for restraint from evil, and for growth in all Christian graces as " the church in the *house*." There stands the domestic altar. There is felt the influence that moulds character from the cradle to the judgment-seat ; such a home on earth is the surest preparation for the Home eternal in the heavens. Of this " church in the house" the parents are the God-ordained pastors. A whole volume might be written on domestic religion ; but I must restrict myself to a few plain hints to parents. On you rests the responsibility.

(1) In the first place, make your home attractive. Put into it every adornment that you can honestly afford. Books, mu-

sical instruments, and pictures are good investments; but nothing will pay better than a bright open fire in the sitting-room. It makes a cheerful rallying-place for the whole family. Ned will not be so anxious to run off to the theatre or to the billiard-rooms, and Mary will not be so hungry for the opera or the ball-room; they will be easier held fast to a warm glowing heart-shrine. Around that fireside you, father, ought to spend as many evenings as possible. The music of your daughter's piano ought to be sweeter to you than the screechings of any imported *prima donna.* A pleasant game with your children, or a good romp with them, or a half hour with them over their lessons will make them love you the more, and will banish the cares that over-loaded you during the day. To have such a home, you must make it. The husband that forsakes his household for his club or any other haunt, and a wife who lives in a constant round of outside engagements, do not deserve to have a home; and from it their children will soon be glad to escape. It is idle for you to forbid your children to attend places of amusement if you provide no innocent wholesome recreation for them. A Christian father of my acquaintance has a music-room in his house; and another one has a billiard-table at which he plays with his own boys. When two young people united with my church, their father said to me, "I have always *anchored* my children at home, and now I see the fruits of it." When boys and girls *drift* from their homes, they commonly fetch up on the lee-shore of ruin.

(2) Remember that for the religion of your household you are chiefly responsible. Sunday-schools are admirable institutions; but their original object was to reach the children who had no religious instruction at home. They were never intended to release Christian parents from the obligations which God lays upon them. All the Sunday-schools in the world could never have done for me what my godly mother did—in my early rural home. Books for children were scarce sixty years ago; and my juvenile literature for Sunday was the Bible, "Pilgrim's Progress" and the "New England Primer." The "Primer" contained its doggerel rhymes, its picture and story of John Rogers the martyr at the stake, and the Westminster Catechism. That Catechism ground into my memory has been my compend of theology and sheet-anchor of orthodoxy to this day; and to its form of sound words I have held forth with as tight a grip as a churchman holds to his Prayer-book, or a Scotch Highlander to the plaid of his clan. God's Word thoroughly learned, Bunyan and the Catechism were the *dairy* that supplied the "sincere milk" of our childhood; it was fed to us by a praying, loving mother's hand. Has a half century of boasted progress made any improvement on that strong diet? Is one hour on the Sabbath in a school any substitute for your wholesome instruction of your children in divine things all the week?

The most effective religious influence you exert upon your sons and daughters does not come from the books you teach them, but from the *example* you set before them. Your character streams into your children; it enters through their eyes and through their ears every hour. How quick they are to imitate! No photographic plate is more sensitive to the images which lodge there. Your irritations irritate them; your dissimulations make them tricky and deceitful; your malicious gossip sets "their teeth on edge." If you talk "money-money," they will conclude that the chief end of life is to get rich. If you prefer the play-house to prayer-meeting, they will become lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God. If you set a decanter on your table, your boys will sip their first wine-glasses there. If you give your child a *dollar* for the toy-shop or a place of amusement, and only a *dime* for the contribution-box, you teach them that self-indulgence is ten times more important than Christian benevolence. If you live for the world, your children may die in wordliness and be lost forever. Not more surely do you provide the clothes for their bodies, than you weave the habits of their lives and the mind-garments that they will be wearing after you are dead. As clothes are made stitch by stich, so you weave their character by numberless little things and by your *unconscious influence.* The Christian or un-Christian atmosphere of every house is created by the parents.

Outbreaks of passion have a terrible influence on your children. A very cultured gentleman of my acquaintance pleads as his excuse when he gets enraged: "I can't help it. My father was just so; his boys are all so. We cannot live together in peace; we never did. We are all possessed of the devil." What a penalty the living sons are paying for the sin of him who first brought that "devil" into the household! Where there is a *profession* of piety behind all such volcanic exhibitions, what disgust for religion must be excited in the young hearts that witness them!

(3) While I would not underrate the in-

fluence of the father—for good or for evil—yet it is mainly the mother who controls the home and imparts to it its prevailing *atmosphere*. Susannah Wesley's hand rings all the Methodist church-bells around the globe. Commonly it is true that *like mother like man*. If the mother is frivolous, prayerless and fashion-loving, and careless of the spiritual influence of her children, the whole home-atmosphere feels the taint. As soon try to raise oranges in Greenland as expect to find much early piety under that roof. The downward pull of the mother's influence through the week is apt to be too strong for the upward pull of the best preaching or teaching on the Sabbath. On the other hand, if she does her utmost to make the religion of Jesus attractive to her family, if she is watchful of every opportunity to lead them Christward, if she follows up the effect of the Sabbath-gospel by the more powerful influence of home-gospel, there is almost a certainty that God will send his converting grace into that household. Richard Cecil, the great London preacher, says that he tried to be an infidel when he was a youth; but he could not gainsay or resist his mother's beautiful piety. He tells us that "she used to talk to me and weep as she talked. I flung out of the house with an oath, but *I cried too* when I had got out into the street. Sympathy is the powerful engine of a mother." Yes; and if all mothers were but fervent in prayer and winsome in their every-day religion we should behold what Dr. Bushnell calls the "out-populating power of the Christian stock." The Church in the house would feed the Church at the communion-table in God's house.

(4) There are two kinds of Christianity in the home. One is a pious sham; the other is a solid reality. One parent prays for the conversion of his family and then sets them an example of money-worship or fast living, and even cracks jokes, talks politics and gives Sunday dinners after the most solemn sermons in the sanctuary. The other parent not only prays for the conversion of his and her children, but aims *to live them toward Christ*. The conversation of the fireside, the books selected for their reading, the amusements chosen for their recreation, the society that is invited, and the aims set before them, all bear in one way and that the right way. It is in the power of every parent to help or also to sadly hinder the salvation of their offspring. "Chips of the old block" are most of our children after all. Then how vitally important is it that the old blocks be sound timber! To train up a family wisely and for the Lord requires more sagacity than to write a book, and more grace than to preach a sermon. On the preaching *in the home* depends the extension of the Church and the safety of the commonwealth. May God help all parents to fulfil their high and holy trusteeship!

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

THE CZAR'S JUDENHETZE.

From *The New York Tribune*, December 28, 1890.

TIME brings no abatement of the hardships suffered by the Jews in Russia. The public protests so freely and fervently uttered in almost all countries of the civilized world are unheeded. The humble petitions of thousands of loyal and industrious Jews in Russia are also unheeded. Perhaps, though, unheeded is not the right word. Some notice is taken of these things by the Government. But the only result is the very reverse of what is prayed for. The hapless Israelites are treated all the more severely, by way of punishing them for not rejoicing under persecution and for having sympathetic friends elsewhere. The venerable rabbi who declared that this was the worst persecution since the Babylonish captivity was not far wrong. Certainly not in all the Dark Ages, not even in Spain, were the "Chosen People" treated worse than now. The extra-legal persecutions need not be named. They are really too horrible, in many cases, to name. It seems to be generally understood that any crime committed by a "Christian" against a Jew will be winked at; and so every imaginable outrage and infamy is heaped upon them. But apart from these things the legal and officially authorized oppression is bad enough to make this age notable in the history of persecution. It is well, in sober earnest, to review briefly the legislation, if arbitrary decrees be legislation, aimed specifically at the Jews.

To begin with taxes. All Russians are heavily taxed. But in addition to the taxation which they share with the rest of the people, the Jews suffer several special taxes. One of these is the box tax, which is levied upon every pound of meat butchered according to Jewish rites, which means, of course, all the meat eaten by Jews. This increases the cost of meat to Jews about 25 per cent above the cost of meat to Christians. But this tax goes further than meat. It is levied on the rents of all buildings owned by Jews, on the profits of all business conducted by Jews, upon all property bequeathed by Jews to their heirs, upon all clothing worn by Jews, and on various other Jewish interests. For example, every Jew has to pay $3.50 a year for the privilege of wearing a skull-cap at family prayers, according to the universal custom of his people. Nor is this the only tax on his religious rites, for there is another so-called candle-tax, which is levied upon all candles burned by Jews in religious observances. Now, it is the custom for every Jewish housewife to light at least two candles on every Sabbath and on every festival day. The aggregate of this candle-tax is an enormous sum. There is, also, a printing-tax, levied on all printing-presses operated by Jews, ranging from $14 to $140, according to the size of the press.

It is safely reckoned then that these various special levies make the average taxation of Jews more than twice as heavy as that of Christians. Nor are there any compensating advantages. On the contrary, in all other relations to the State the Jew is at a great disadvantage. Take military affairs as an example. Jews are subject to conscription as Christians are, but they are not permitted, as are Christians, to hire substitutes. If a Christian evades military duty he is fined a small amount, and if he cannot pay it there is an end of it. But in the case of a Jew a fine of $210 is imposed, not on him, but on his family, and they must pay it or go to prison, the whole of them. Moreover, a much larger proportion of Jews than of Gentiles are drafted into service. Yet it is only as private soldiers that they can serve. No Jew can ever become a commissioned officer nor enter a school for the training of officers. All the more desirable forms of military service are denied to Jews utterly, and almost every privilege accorded to their comrades is forbidden to them.

In civil life the discrimination against them is, if possible, still more severe. No Jew may enter the civil service or practise law or medicine. No Jew may hold any local or municipal office or take part in any election for the same. No Jew may be a member of a school board, or be a police magistrate, nor be foreman of a jury, nor be master or vice-master of a guild.

If such is the oppression of the Jews in their public relations, what degree of liberty do they enjoy in their private life? There the picture is, if possible, more distressing still. With a few exceptions Jews are allowed to reside only in certain places. Once settled they are forbidden to move. No Jew may own land in any form or for any purpose, nor may he cultivate any land which he may hire. Indeed, he is forbidden to hire agricultural land at all. He may lend money on land if he likes, but he cannot foreclose the mortgage. Nor may he act as manager or steward on a farm. Thus, while it is complained of the Jews that they monopolize trade in the towns, the law itself drives them into the towns and forbids them to live elsewhere. And then once herded in the towns, what are they to do? They must stay right there. They cannot even remove from one town to another. Nay, a Jew is not even permitted to walk a mile outside the town limits unless he first secures a passport, for which, of course, he must pay a round sum. And in the town he is compelled by law to be a member of some guild or trade association, but the master and vice-master of the guild must be Christians, and those officers have absolute authority over the members to fine or expel them at will. The result is that in all industrial pursuits the Jews suffer just as odious a discrimination as in public life.

To go further still into the private life of the Jews, it is to be observed that in no school are there allowed to be more than 10 per cent of Jewish pupils. In many towns the Jews form 50 per cent or more of the population, and so the majority of their children are denied school privileges. No relief can be obtained by sending the children to school in other places, where the number of resident Jews does not come up to the 10 per cent limit, because the law expressly declares that children of Jewish parents are allowed to attend school only in the place where their parents live. In brief, this is compulsory non-attendance at school. Moreover, the higher seminaries, music and art schools, etc., are found only in three or four of the chief cities, and of course are open only to Jewish children actually living in those cities. Such a thing as sending a Jewish child from the provinces to study music or art at St. Petersburg is absolutely prohibited. In domestic affairs, if a wife or a husband is converted to Christianity, she or he is, by that fact, divorced from the other who remains a Jew; and the convert may marry again, but the Jew must remain single. If one parent be converted all young children of the same sex must also be baptized as Christians. Moreover, a reward of from $10 to $20 is offered to every one who will renounce Judaism for Christianity; and many family dissensions naturally follow. As to religious worship, it is absolutely forbidden in private houses, except by special permission. That is, every Jew must secure a license to hold family prayers, or even to pray in private in his own bedchamber. Public worship in a synagogue is only permitted in places having eighty or more Jewish houses. So, in places with less than eighty Jewish houses, religious worship by Jews is totally forbidden.

But are these laws actually enforced! Certainly, to the very letter, and more. It is an every-day occurrence for Jews to be arrested, fined and imprisoned for praying without licenses. Children of wayward habits are bribed to profess Christianity and then to betray their parents in their religious observances. Moreover, the farming out of tax-gathering works great hardships. For instance, a "box-tax" of $10,000 is levied on the Jews in a given town by the provincial Governor. The local tax gatherer thereupon increases it to $15,000, in order to put $5000 in his own pocket. The subordinate collectors in the various wards of the town follow his example in order to fill their own pockets. The result is that the original levy is about doubled. It is now rumored that more stringent laws still are to be promulgated; and the only question seems to be, how far will it be possible for unbridled and brutal tyranny to go?

THE ORIGIN AND SCOPE OF THE KING'S DAUGHTERS.

BY MRS. MARGARET BOTTOME.

From *The Christian Advocate*, December 25, 1890.

A SISTERHOOD! There has always been a sort of fascination to me in the word sisterhood, aside from the Christly work you would expect a sister to do. And during the years of what has been called my drawing-room work in the city of New York, I had often felt the need of something to bind us together as women representing every denomination of the Christian Church. This impression was on my mind when, in the summer of 1885, the Rev. Edward Everett Hale, D.D., called on me, at my residence, No. 230 West Fifty-ninth Street, and in the interview explained to me the nature and working of his "Ten-times-one-is-ten" clubs, which interested me greatly, renewing the convictions which had been so long silently working in my mind, closing the interview with the remark that he had watched my public work among women, and suggested whether I did not think I was "just the one to found a sisterhood in which women could unite, for the love of Christ, to serve the Master?" The interview and its closing suggestion greatly startled me, as showing thoughts and desires to which I had as yet given no shape. A little while afterward I called to my side four friends of kindred spirit, and opened to them my views on the subject; having already written to Dr. Hale, and obtained from him his very cheerful consent to use his method of working in "Tens," and such of his mottoes as might be serviceable in any work which I might determine on. In the consultation with my friends on the subject we had the thought distinctly before us of deepening spiritual life; something that, while embracing all philanthropic effort, should first of all appear in the life and heart, in devotion to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. My friends were in perfect accord with my views, and at my suggestion each one invited another from her own circle of friends to meet together at my house to a further consideration of the subject, and for such plans as we might thereupon agree to. Accordingly, in January, 1886, at my home thus invited, these ten ladies met to consider the subject of starting a sisterhood of service.

After much prayer and earnest consultation we put ourselves into form, calling ourselves the "Central Ten," since known as the Central Council, from which, as others should be invited, other circles or "tens" should be formed. For the present we adopted also the mottoes of the "Ten-times-one-is-ten" clubs, and as our great purpose was to glorify the Master, we took the significant watchword, "In His Name."

After several names had been mentioned, one of our number suggested as the name of the Order, "The King's Daughters," which was at once adopted. Desirous of avoiding undue publicity, or in any way to interfere or supplant any existing organization of Christian effort, or to antagonize the Churches in doctrine or creed, we issued our first leaflet, which, while seeking simply to explain our plan, should be a guide for the service of such other "Tens" as might from time to time be formed. As we were not a church, but members of several denominations of the Christian body, we were careful to lay down as the basis of co-operation with each other the declaration of our faith and loyalty to the King, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and to welcome all to union of effort with us who on this basis could believe and work in His name. It was not long, however, before we found ourselves forced into public print, and our name and work published abroad so widely and so rapidly that in self-defense we felt compelled to legalize the Order, and so obtained a charter under the name by which we have been all along known, and under the constitution which, in better form, but in the same declaration and spirit which our first circular had already expressed. Under this constitution and in the spirit and letter of our first organization the Order has become world-wide.

Our desire from the first has been that the force of the Order should be felt in its simple suggestiveness, rather than in any independent method or doctrine. We are not a church, but offer ourselves as handmaidens to any effort of the Church for the building up of the Redeemer's kingdom under whatever denomination, leaving the members of each Circle to determine for themselves the method and character of their work or belief, according to their own accepted theological views and Church order. In all our teaching we have spoken of the Order as four-sided: First, the *heart*. The first duty is with our King, the recognition and acknowledgment that He is our King, and that we wish to be His loyal subjects; yielding to Him ourselves in loving obedience and trust. After the heart comes the *home*. The duty that lies next to her is the duty of every King's Daughter; and if she has a mother, the mother comes first. So we have many Circles, called "Home Brighteners," "Sunshine Circles"—circles formed to keep the wrinkles from coming too soon on the brow of father and mother. (I know of one Circle that has taken for its work, "Devoted Attention to Mother's Need." At the head of that Circle is the daughter of a Methodist minister. She has taken the care of housekeeping off her mother's hands. She said to me, smilingly: "You see, mother is so devoted to the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society, that I want to have her free from home cares." From the first we have emphasized the doing of little things in His name.) After the home comes *the church*—the church to which such Daughters belong. Where can they find so ready a field for Christian service as in their own church and under direction of their own pastor? And if pastors are wise they will use their services in carrying forward the various work of the church. Correspondence with many pastors bears beautiful testimony to the usefulness of Circles in all departments of church work. It is not a society for new work. It takes old work in a fresh spirit. No better definition of the Order can be given than that which one of our own beloved bishops gave it a little while ago: "The Order," he said, "is an inspiration, a perfume, the blossoming out of a flower."

The Daughters and Sons in their Circles can effectively promote the interests of the Epworth League, or Christian Endeavor, or any other department of Christian work that may come to their hands. In many instances, where a Sabbath-school teacher has failed in efforts to interest her class, the suggestion of the simple Circle banded together, "In His Name," has had the effect of not only winning attention and respect, but ultimately of winning all hearts to the Master. And the same is true where the suggestion has been applied to the class-meeting.

I know of one excellent class-leader who adopted the Circle plan, and by the new inspiration which the significant watchword of the Order gave to the novelty of it soon made the class overflow with an enthusiastic membership. Very wisely the Rev. J. B. Hamilton, of New York East Conference, who has the cause of our "worn-out preachers" on his heart and brain, calls to the King's Daughters in our Methodist churches to take up the subject and work for "the veterans." Already we know of "Tens" formed for this work. Then after the *heart*, the *home*, and the *church* comes the *great outside*—the awfully sad and sinful outside. And to this outside our King is leading us. The "Inasmuch Circles" did not mean as much to us at first as they do now. Some of us have gone out under the pressure of our significant motto, and have found the great outside world sorrowing and crying for help and sympathy, and sometimes finding other laborers who had gone out into the field before us, some as representatives of other Christian societies, and some alone, but whose hands were hanging down in despair at the greatness of the work and the littleness of Christian support, and these have been cheered and helped as they felt the pressure of loving hands on their shoulders, and heard the hearty greeting, "We have come to help you." And so together, as well as singly, the Circles of the King's Daughters are found in every field of labor and every place of need.

A very efficient service under the organization has been formed by the Sons of the King (this is not a distinct Order, but only the same Order for the benefit of Sons who are willing to co-operate with the Daughters under the same Central Council and Constitution) called the Rescue Circles. These Circles have branches in various cities which are under operation for the special work of rescuing the drunkard and the fallen. In this connection many distinct missions for this special work are in most active progress, and the reports from them are of most encouraging character. Meanwhile, Chapters have been formed, embracing several Circles, whose chosen work is such relief as can be given to the poor and friendless in the crowded tenement districts of our large cities; and whose reports bear testimony not only to faithful work done, but equally to the sad need of greatly multiplied agencies. In the more distinctive work of general evangelization are our regularly organized departments of Christian Missions, both Home and Foreign, and it is only necessary to say that these are under the direction of Mrs. William B. Skidmore, the beloved and efficient secretary also of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to assure every one of the thoroughness and spirit in which the Circles forming this department are conducted. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union finds equally an efficient co-operation in the department established for that work.

Not the least interesting work that is being done in other departments in our large cities and towns is that among the working girls in the stores and factories, and active Circles in every branch of labor in all parts of the country witness how sweetly and effectively the silent influence of the little silver cross is benefiting that large and often overburdened class of society, and, by the sympathy which it exerts, bridging the gulf between its members and their more favored sisters. Such, in general, is the scope which the Order gives to its suggestive idea of personal consecration of the heart to the King, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and of common service to humanity, "In His Name."

The Central Council has never arrogated authority of discipline in either creed or conduct over other members of the Order, further than their simple declaration, as above stated, as the basis of unity between them. Matters of discipline must be left to the churches and pastors in whose interests and under whose direction they may be serving. In these days, when I look out upon the activities of the world both for good and evil, and then look upon the Church of Jesus Christ in the midst of it, with all the good it is doing, and yet see how little she is effecting, and how fearful a waste there is, both in the doing and in the want of doing, I seem to hear again, in awful tones, the voice of the Master crying: "Why stand ye here all the day idle?" Lift up your eyes and see; behold! the fields are white already to the harvest! It is in answer to that cry, and in the spirit of that mission, that we women of the Central Council of the King's Daughters welcome any to our side who, for the sake of Christ and "In His Name," will thrust in the sickle, and bring in sheaves for the harvest. The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few. More laborers! more laborers! Who will say, "Here am I, send me?"

LOYALTY AND CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR.

BY J. W. DOANE FRANCIS, BOSTON.

From *The Episcopal Recorder*, January 1, 1891.

THE words are synonymous—the Christian who makes the underlying principles his own will never be found other than loyal to Christ, to the Church, to the best that is in himself, and to the best that is in the world. He stands in readiness for the Master's use, and acts in obedience to the Master's will. The loyalty of the Society is but the sum of that of the individual member. A Gideon's band with the spirit of a Gideon will accomplish more than a mixed multitude. Societies fastened to the common centre, as spokes are fastened to the hub, are united and strong, but an army with many banners invites defeat. I would speak of the Endeavor Society, its strength and its weakness, and plead an unswerving loyalty from every member and every society to the one banner of our Lord and Saviour.

The growth of the Society has been phenomenal. It has been welcomed by most evangelical denominations. Its societies are counted by the thousands. Its membership by the hundred thousand. It has called into active service those who had been idlers in the vineyard. It has called forth other multitudes who, under God, it has been the means of bringing into new life, and by setting them to work ere the flush of the new-born holy zeal could fade, has given them the opportunity to know by experience the sweetness of labor for Christ, and has held them for the Church. Many are the country churches who have taken a new lease of life and courage, because of the young people's meeting. The same is true of many city churches. It has been thought by some because I had criticised certain practices of Endeavor Circles, that I was adverse to the idea. Far from it. In the very article, speaking of the Eighth Annual Convention, I said, "I was there convinced that the Christian Endeavor movement was ordained of God, for the quickening of His servants, and the sending them forth into all the world to prepare for His coming. I have not changed my opinion." Its growth, coupled with the spiritual work accomplished, are the seals to the Divine commission. I have criticised the Society because I would have it above criticism, and because such criticism coming from within the ranks may be the more effective.

Grand as the work has been, there are tendencies, little leaks in the dyke, which weaken its supporters, strengthen the opposition, and threaten to destroy the influence of the Society. As noble a Christian as Rev. A. J. Gordon warned the societies not to give undue prominence to social life. Many good people who have never attended a Christian Endeavor prayer-meeting will pass over fifty-two well sustained prayer-meetings, pointing with scornful triumph to the solitary "cobweb social," as an evidence that the spiritual life is being crowded out, and at once condemns all societies, north, south, east and west. The President of the United Societies, Dr. Clark, is a most estimable Christian, whom God has highly honored by calling to the special service. Bearing his high office with humility, God has given him wisdom richly, and it would seem to require almost superhuman wisdom, and an organization far more compact than the present, to guide so vast a throng unerringly. It must be remembered that each society is absolutely independent of the United Society and of all others, being under the direct control of the local church. Yet although the only power wielded by the United Society is the power of a moral influence, it is held responsible for the doings of all.

The fact that so many denominations are represented is not an unmixed blessing. When the time for the convention arrives, speakers must be selected to represent as many as possible, and unless the greatest care is used, discordant notes will arise. It is of infinite value that these speakers should be sound in the faith. Alas! they sometimes seem to be selected because they stand high in their denomination, and with little regard to their theology. This is a serious fault.

But by far the greater danger which threatens the organization is that which comes from its great numerical success. The striving for eminence in names and figures as an indication of success is fraught with danger. A ship may be sunk by having too many on board, as well as too few. We have enlarged our borders so freely and so often that now we find in our midst those who are not of us, and whose potent influence is foreign to the original design.

In the Massachusetts Convention it was painful to see the demoralization caused by the admission of a few—a very few—liberal societies. Humanitarianism was exalted, broad views extolled, and the statement made, amid applause, that the white-light of Christianity was found in the blending of the three primal colors of the religious prism—Calvinistic, Armenian and Liberal theology. This may sound well, but every Endeavorer who is loyal to Christ should resent such teaching. Try it with a text, "All should honor the Son, *even as they honor the Father*: he that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father" (John v. 23).

Some of us have seen the havoc made in the Order of King's Daughters by the admission of liberals to that once stanch Trinitarian Society. All of us know what the toleration of a few germs of Romish error has wrought in the ranks of the Episcopal communion. The attempt to mingle oil with water has ever resulted in rendering the water unfit. Therefore, as Endeavorers true to the first principles, and as Reformed Episcopalians loyal to the truth as it is in Jesus, and knowing by experience the sad consequences of tolerating error, it seems to me to be our duty to protest against the admission of these aliens to the faith. And to this end, I submit the following resolution of protest:

To the United Society of Christian Endeavor:

WHEREAS, The admission of the societies of the liberal churches is detrimental to the best interests and sound faith of the Societies of Christian Endeavor,

Resolved, That we members of the Christian Endeavor of the Reformed Episcopal Church do herewith protest against the admission of said liberal societies.

When we have performed this duty, perhaps we shall be able to perfect and extend the work in our own Church, until every parish shall have its Christian Endeavor Society, every society shall be an aggressive missionary centre, and all shall be united in a progressive denominational union. May the Lord grant it speedily.

THE REAL ISSUE.

From *The New York Observer* (Presbyterian), January 15, 1891.

THE camel has succeeded in getting his head inside the door and now the churches are compelled to decide whether to make him take his head out or to let the rest of him in without regard to the number of his humps. His head would have been in long ago, except for a sense of honor and duty which once made it impossible for men of a certain class to profess what they rejected and opposed. Modern rationalism in Germany, in the person of its most renowned advocate, published an elaborate exposition of the methods by which an infidel teacher might retain his position as a Professor of Theology, just as Cardinal Newman shocked the moral sense of England by an equally elaborate exposition of the methods by which a Romanist might profess to be and perform all the functions of a Protestant minister. It is not worth while to unravel the moral twist which enables otherwise honorable men to occupy and defend such positions. It is now a conspicuous fact, attracting general attention, that men occupying prominent positions in Protestant churches openly question and actively oppose the faith of those churches, as this is embodied in their standards, catechisms, liturgies and hymnology. They are called by their admirers "champions of liberty of thought." This liberty consists in rejecting whatever they consider unworthy of belief in the faith of the Church, and in teaching, preaching and writing to antagonize this faith and advocate their own "advanced" ideas. For some time the various evangelical churches have acted on the principle that individual cases of defection were less injurious by not being made prominent through prosecution and trial. This leniency has doubtless tended to increase the number of those who have no sympathy with the position of their churches, and also the boldness of those who have been described as breaking the church windows by throwing stones from the pulpit.

It ought by this time to be understood by the least informed on religious subjects that the practical question now agitating the churches is simply whether their teachers are in any way bound to teach what the churches have hitherto held as Christian doctrine and still confess with their mouth as the divinely revealed truth of God. It is more a question of morals than religion. Some young man who has forced the issue to a point that is absurd would doubtless enjoy a grand discussion of the higher criticism that has destroyed his confidence in the verity of the Gospels. He would like to have the fathers of the Church deal with him in respect to the merits of his brilliant discoveries concerning what man ought to think in regard to Christ and God. He will eloquently remonstrate with his objectors who insist upon determining and declaring whether he is false to his professions, unfaithful to his trust, completely incapable of doing the work which he has solemnly vowed to perform. He will say, Do not bring in these unpleasant, practical issues. Forget what you and the Church believe and just compare the sweet reasonableness of my ideas with those old-time bigotries. What you need is instruction. You have not examined the marvellous analyses of the higher critics. You do not assimilate the hypotheses of the evolutionists. You do not seem to know the men who now determine the Word of God and expound the universe. Give these men their due and you will be better able to say whether a clergyman must believe what he says when he repeats the creed and vows to teach the doctrines of the Church as these have been held for generations by the great body of the faithful. This is no travesty of what is actually urged, in almost every case that is forced to an issue. We speak from experience, for at the very outset of the controversy with Andover, which has resulted in protracted litigation in the civil courts, the expositors and defenders of the new theology insisted that their new departure should be treated and discussed purely on its own merits, and that the issue of consistency, honesty and fidelity should be ignored. We showed at the time that this endeavor to avoid the issue was vain, and that sooner or later judgment would be rendered by the law or public opinion or both.

This question as to whether the evangelical Churches are to become Broad Churches, in the sense of having no well-defined faith, retaining their standards merely as meaningless relics, is vastly more important in respect to the theological seminaries than in respect to the pulpits. Pulpits change in their character with changes in the ministry. Individuals may wander here and there, "cruising around after truth," and do no more than make people stare a little at their eccentricities. There is much in all well-established churches to counteract the destructive tendencies of rationalistic contempt for the supernatural in the Word of God and the faith of Christendom. But it is not possible to exaggerate the dangers that now threaten the strongest of the Protestant Churches in the teaching that is already tolerated in some of their theological seminaries in Scotland and in America. Because men are learned, brilliant, popular, they are retained in or appointed to positions where they have the opportunity to mould the character of hundreds of pulpits. Though these men make no secret of having surrendered one after another of the outposts by which the Church has grandly held its own against the world, they are for the sake of peace, of charity, of popularity with them that are without, permitted to go on with their work. So influential is their labor, or the labor of others, in undermining the faith and removing landmarks, that we are now assured that it is already too late to repair damages. It is said that the attempt to exercise discipline would leave the enterprising prosecutor in the position of the man who sits on the limb which he is engaged in cutting off.

Are our greatest evangelical churches no longer able to lift up the standard against the enemy that attacks the Word of God with " difficulties," " discrepancies," " variations," " errors," " immoralities," and all the other " objections" to the fact of inspiration? We well remember when every well-appointed theological school in America and Scotland was furnished with strong men who were more than equal to the task of maintaining the integrity and infallibility of the Scriptures. Such men still abound and occupy chairs now in our theological seminaries, second to none in their piety, their learning, and their ability. These men and their predecessors have believed through the Spirit that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and that their Divine Master spoke intelligently when He said that the Scripture cannot be broken. Is it true that the day of such men and such teaching and such triumph is almost gone, with the old notions of depravity, the old conviction of sin, and the old joy of salvation in Jesus the only Redeemer? In spite of the extraordinary developments in Scotland and in America, we do not believe it is. It is indeed a time of danger when destructive criticism of the Bible and destructive evolutionary theology are tolerated in our schools and pulpits. But whether tolerated or sent to the places where they belong, it is no time for believers in the Word of God as this has been held by us and our fathers, to be either discouraged or pessimistic. Sooner or later, moral public opinion will compel the Churches to be honest in their confessions and professions. They cannot build a road so broad that they can avoid deciding what they believe concerning God and His revelation of Himself. If they decide that these latest attacks upon the unity, consistency and authority of the Word of God are not matters to be confronted by sanctified learning and illuminating faith, but, on the contrary, are literary and scientific achievements to be welcomed and engrafted on the remnants of an outworn creed, then those whose minds and hearts are differently guided will have more reason than ever to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.

THE PRESENT CRISIS.

BY C. H. SPURGEON.

From *The Sword and the Trowel*, January, 1891.

The age is on the stir. Some sadly compare it to " the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt;" and the analogy certainly holds good to a very high degree. Others liken the period to the awakening days of spring, when all the pent-up forces burst into action, and prophesy a season of growth and fruit. There is truth in this also, although the awakening energies are not all those of goodness, and caution asks the question, " What will the harvest be?"

In any case, the constable of society cries roughly, " Move on;" and the throngs in the streets of Mansoul insist that every one shall proceed one way or another. Virtuous advances, if possible; but advances, even if virtue be left behind: such is the restless demand of the time. Politics in a hurry takes to alliances which patriotism formerly forbade, and ventures upon stratagems which old-fashioned honesty would have condemned. Benevolence in a fever will not stay to consider possible failure, and assured hazard; but declares that the die is cast, and goes in for a vast experiment. Liberty, sick of her own sweets, turns to despotic power as, at least in religion, the cure for her feebleness. Religion itself, weary of laborious advance, regards her holy scruples as *impedimenta,* and adopts the methods of the world, while her doctrinal teaching is left, like some ancient Cæsar's camp, to be viewed as a curiosity by this advanced generation. These are serious alterations; are they improvements?

Those who have no delight in unsettlement and useless change are by no means indifferent spectators of the childish freaks of this light-headed generation. As fresh developments appear, the question arises, again and again, "What next?" and with the enquiry comes the sigh, "O Lord, how long?" Certain of us are distressed beyond measure by that which others enter upon with a light heart. To mention this is to bring upon such dissentients a storm of ridicule. Our regrets cause no concern to the changeful ones. Why should they? They despise the old fogies who cannot, like themselves, rush into the bogs after the jack-o'-lantern of progress. "Doctrine!" cry they, "who cares for *that?* Calling it "dogma," they make a football of it, and again they shout, "Who cares?" Without waiting for an answer, they hurry forward in their infallible wisdom to exercise their liberality of spirit by scoffing at the narrow-minded orthodox. "Waters of a full cup are wrung out to them." New teachings and new methods mar the peace of churches which, for many generations, have held to the once-delivered faith. The intrusion has been wanton and illegal; but what of that? Protests are of no avail : it usually suffices to answer them with a sneer. Where contempt would scarcely be prudent, the pretence of agreement is made to cover over a fatal difference, and to give opportunity to stab the truth in the back. All things appear to be regarded as fair in the conflict with old-fashioned believers: they are a kind of creature with whom no faith is to be kept, and to whom no rights are reserved. No matter how venerable in years, profound in knowledge, or great in usefulness a man may be, let him hold to the old faith, and he has thereby forfeited every claim to regard. "*He was the founder of the church.*" He has ruled it too long! "*He has been its principal pillar for many years.*" It is time that there was a change! "*He is gentle, and of tender spirit. It is cruel to oppose him.*" Men cannot be considered; if they are opposed to modern progress, they must endure the inevitable! This is the spirit of the new religion—the religion of "humanity," the religion of "thought and culture." So to describe it is to give serious offence, but the description has been proved to be emphatically true in many instances; and others will be forthcoming with cruel certainty in due time.

Is anything more precious given to us in the place of the doctrine which is said to be obsolete, and is therefore to be scouted? By no means. The substitutes for Solomon's shields of gold are not made of diamond, but of brass, and that brass of a poor sort. The dishes of solid meat are removed from the table, and pottage of the most watery sort occupies the room—a pottage into which wild gourds have been shred, so that there is "death in the pot." The results patent to all, in many cases, are the decay of piety, the death of prayer-meetings, the frequenting of theatres and other places of amusement, lax morals, and a general worldliness of life. Need we go far to find Nonconformist churches which will never be accused of Puritanism, but might truthfully be called clubs for social, political, literary, and sportive purposes? Of course, the provision of amusement is judged to be laudable, and by no means a thing requiring to be defended; while the holding of bazaars, in which the stage itself is left in the rear, and Vanity Fair is outdone, is justified and commended. We have "Institutes" for youth, where the gambler tries his unaccustomed hand, and "sing-songs," where the frequenter of the low music-hall acquires his first taste for the comic and the loose. The more "liberal" the doctrine, the more free-and-easy the living. These are the new lamps which are offered us for the old. We are to barter away the gold of Ophir, and receive, in exchange, the mud of the Dead Sea. Will all professors have it so? Will the free churches be in the forefront of this mad movement toward the abyss?

It is cheering to believe that many have of late been braced up, and are recovering their footing. Testimony for the gospel is clearer from many pulpits than it was wont to be; for which may God be praised! In other cases the new system has worked itself out; and, aroused by the disastrous result, the people have returned to the truth which they once loved. The heart of the churches is in a great measure sound; and when those who rule the hour are no longer able to silence the much-enduring people, there will be a return to the former beliefs, and this will be accompanied by a firmer adhesion to them in the future. Too much is it a fact that a clique is ruling, and the real voice of the people is unheard.

Be that as it may, believers must look well to the foundations. We need to have the fundamentals laid continually; and doctrines taken for granted must be once more Scripturally proved. More and more must faith renounce dependence upon the arm of flesh, and cling tenaciously to the Lord and his Word, without the admixture of other reliances. Nothing is to be done but to continue "steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord." There is one gospel, and if that be preached in the power of the one Spirit, it must accomplish the purposes of God. God will raise up his own champions. In the way of his Providence he will fight for his own cause. This is all we desire. Party we must have none; personal honor we must not consider; let truth become once more dear to Zion, and by whomsoever the Lord shall work the reformation, it sufficeth us.

If, for her sins, the present visible church shall be left to decline into death, it will be a heavy heart-sickness to the faithful; but even then they have no reason to despair. Out of the stones of Jordan God can raise up children unto Abraham. His purposes fail not. The end of the book of history will show his hand, even if in some of its pages his name be not readily discernible. If he was honored who believed in Rome when her foes were within her walls, so shall he be who believes in the triumph of the faith when apparently overcome by the subtlest of her adversaries. In the most disastrous hour of the march of the army of the Lord, when the Amalekites are smiting the hindmost, he will do well who will take his stand, and hold his ground, and resolve to die beneath the arrows of ridicule rather than suffer harm to the ark of God. There is a faith which turns to flight the armies of the aliens. May we each one possess it now!

A CENTURY OF REVIVALS.

BY REV. A. J. SAGE, D.D.

From *The Examiner* (Baptist), New York, January 8, 1891.

ARE the Baptists of America overlooking an important centenary? If Dr. Fish, in his *Hand-book of Revivals*, is correct, the year 1790 inaugurated a century of revivals, and the First Baptist Church of Boston began the series in a revival with which it was visited during that year. Other denominations assign the commencement of this epoch to the town of East Haddam, Conn., and the date to the year 1792.

THE GREAT AWAKENING.

In either case we are at a point which naturally brings to our consideration one of the most remarkable periods in the history of religion since the days of the apostles. For forty-five years, ending with 1790, an apathy had rested upon the churches. The great religious awakening, commonly known as the Edwards revival, had preceded this torpor. It had continued for more than ten years. It had been promoted by the preaching of such extraordinary men as Whitefield, the Tennents, President Davies, Dr. Bellamy, and Jonathan Edwards. It had prevailed throughout the larger part of colonial America. It had had, in my estimation, an important political, as well as religious, significance. It had promoted that unity of sentiment among colonies not too closely related, which afterward brought their people shoulder to shoulder in the battle of the Revolution. As represented in the account of Edwards and others, it had been marked by extraordinary fervors, by profound heart-searchings and by marvellous inner experiences. Preachers had been so overcome with emotion as to creep up the pulpit steps on hands and knees, and congregations had risen to their feet as one man, magnetized by the power of the preached word. Little children had been the subjects of remarkable gracious influences. Entire communities had been converted. So intense had been the feeling that Edwards wrote his treatise on the religious affections to check the tendency toward excess. Then followed two inevitable results. Fanaticism asserted itself. In eastern Connecticut and elsewhere, Davenport and others led their followers into wild extravagances, and the great revival was dissipated in the frenzies of extremists. On the other hand, a reaction followed in which gloom settled on many minds, some being tempted to suicide, as Edwards testifies, and then religious enthusiasm disappeared in a calm of forty-five years, unmarked by notable revival. The results of this great awakening were highly important, although numerically they do not seem extraordinary. The conversions numbered about fifty thousand.

Why were these reactionary results of which I spoke inevitable? Because the minds and hearts of men had been subjected to an excessive strain. The preaching of the day exalted the supernatural. The divine side of truth was emphasized and the human side was ignored. The sovereignty of God was magnified into an awfulness before which men trembled as helpless creatures groping for some ray of mercy which they dared not expect, and ignorant of that infinite love which in Christ is ever reaching out for the fallen. The smallest sin was represented as deserving eternal sufferings, on which a holy God could look with rejoicing. Religion appeared in tragic robes, enacting the solemn drama of the universe. The strain was too tremendous. Extravagance and reaction into apathy were inevitable consequences.

A GREAT REVIVAL WAVE.

In 1790, if we are to adopt that date, the long repose was broken. Moore's history, as quoted by Dr. Fish, says: "The revivals in the First and Second Baptist churches were the first in the series of revivals wherewith God blessed Boston. The tide of evil with which the city had been flooded for half a century then began to turn." The leader in this revival was that patriarch among Baptists of Boston, Rev. Dr. Baldwin. The results were about two hundred conversions. The event of 1792 had a similar organic relation to what followed. This occurred in East Haddam, Conn., in the form of an extensive religious interest, conducted by Edward D. Griffin, afterward so eminent, then pastor of the Congregational church in New Salem. It was not long before Mr. Griffin became pastor of a church in New Hartford, Conn., at which place another awakening of great power soon took place under his administration. In both of these neighborhoods similar revivals occurred in many churches. Mr. Griffin became noted as a preacher of great evangelistic ability. He was called to the pastorate of the Park Street Church in Boston, where his intense preaching aided materially in giving to the location of its meeting-house the name of Brimstone Corner. In the lecture-room of that church may be seen the likeness of Dr. Griffin, apparently a large man, with broad, benevolent countenance, amid the likenesses of other illustrious pastors of the church, among whom appears Dr. Edward Beecher.

For four years, about the opening of the present century, a great revival prevailed in Kentucky and Tennessee. It was marked by extraordinary physical manifestations, violent jerkings, bouncings, intense rigidities, and trance conditions of bodies, affected with what was called "the power." At least ten thousand persons were added to the Baptist churches in this awakening. It was then that the Cumberland Presbyterians were separated from the main body of the church. It may be remarked in passing that good authorities credit the Presbyterians in Tennessee and other Southern States as the originators of that peculiar Methodist institution, the camp-meeting.

From this time revivals were frequent here and there. Some of these, especially those which took place in New England, are recounted with great particularity in Humphrey's sketches. In Farmington, Conn., in 1799, 61 professed faith, and in 1821, 250. In Pittsfield, Mass., there were 140 converts in 1821. In many other towns and villages in these States, and in Vermont similar awakenings were experienced. Dr. Finney, writing about the year 1835, speaks of 100,000 who had been added to the Presbyterian churches in the revivals of the preceding ten years. The same preacher in 1831 conducted meetings in the Chatham Street Theatre, in New York, through which 2000 were added to the churches. In 1842 4000 were brought into the churches in Boston. From 1815 to 1840, says Dr. Gardiner Spring, the Spirit was poured out on four hundred to five hundred churches annually, and during several years from forty to fifty thousand made profession of faith each year. "The period from 1792 to 1842 was especially fruitful. There was scarcely any portion of it but that was graciously visited by copious effusions of the Holy Spirit." Bishop McIlvaine, of the Episcopal Church, says that about seventy to seventy-five years ago the churches of his own order were accustomed to participate in these revival influences. This fact will seem strange to many readers, accustomed to see Episcopalians standing rigidly aloof from evangelistic movements. Yet it was only four or five years ago that Wall Street poured its brokers and bankers into Trinity Church, crowding it each day at noon to listen to the fervent appeals of Missioner Aitken, from the Established Church of England, and join in his earnest extempore prayers.

The work in various institutions of learning was very important. Under the masterly preaching of President Timothy Dwight, in 1802, in Yale College, hitherto a nest of French infidelity, an intense religious interest was awakened, and 58 young men were converted. By the way, the same institution has not passed beyond the need of similar influences, for in the Sheffield Scientific School a few years ago, when a class was asked who Stephen was, six young men in a row could not tell, and the seventh said he believed he was an Englishman. In Princeton College in 1815, under Dr. Ashbel Green, forty out of one hundred and five young men were converted. At West Point Academy, in 1826, there was a revival in which Bishop McIlvaine participated. Readers of the very interesting life of Mary Lyon, well know what a powerful religious influence she exerted in the Holyoke Seminary of which she was the founder and principal. These are but a few among many instances.

A SECOND REVIVAL WAVE.

The most notable event of the century, however, was the revival of 1857–58, the greatest in American history. Extensive disasters in the business world had prepared the way for it. The visible agency in its inception was as insignificant as that employed in some other great events. A cow kicked a lamp over and Chicago was burned. A devoted city missionary, Rev. Mr. Lanphier, assembled three others with himself for prayer in New York City and America was set on fire. The meeting grew. In three months it was known throughout the city. It was transferred to the old Dutch church on Fulton Street, long since torn down. It set the pattern for revival services over all the land, as a noonday prayer-meeting for business men. Its method was that of brief, crisp, stirring addresses and prayers. The lay element came to the front. Requests for prayers were sent in numbers to be presented at the meetings, and numerous remarkable answers to prayers thereupon offered were reported. For the first time the newspapers by their extended reports became vigorously helpful to a religious movement. The penitents were observed to find Christ without the long delays and severe struggles that had marked former revivals. The telegraph, with the railroad, gave facilities for rapid communication between distant points never before enjoyed in similar circumstances. The consequence was such a revival as probably the world had never before seen. The country was alive with one spirit and one interest. Five hundred thousand souls are said to have been converted in one year.

Should it be a cause of rejoicing or of sadness that the Fulton Street prayer-meeting is still in existence ? Or has it noiselessly died within a year or two ? When I visited it, perhaps two years ago, it was thinly attended. Gray-haired men were conducting it. I fancied I could hear the creak of pulleys and cranks in the effort to give it life and spring. Over one entrance there seemed to be written Ichabod ; over the other, Nehusthan ; and I wondered whether there were not needed some Hezekiah to break in pieces the serpent of brass. When the special means which God has honored in a revival seems to have lost its efficiency, it should not be worshipped. It should be allowed to pass away. He will raise up a new agency in his own time and manner.

Of evangelistic movements since the great revival I shall not attempt to write. Suffice it that they have been such as to complete the record of a hundred years, and to justify the expression, a century of revivals. There are denominations, indeed, in which many churches, from year to year, report not a single conversion. But there are multitudes of churches in which evangelistic methods are steadily pursued, and converts are quietly gathered in by scores and hundreds. Indeed, one of the signs of the times is seen in the fact that revivals which a half century ago would have been put on record as marvellous, now take place almost as matters of course, and are not thought exceptional enough for more than passing mention in the newspaper. Between the years 1850 and 1870 additions to the churches numbered 3,143,408. From 1870 to 1880, one half the time, they numbered 3,392,567. No great land-wide revival is on record during the latter period, but the more than duplicated increase suggests that the fruits of 1857 and 1858 were not alone in the recorded conversions. but in the spiritual impulse as well, which made the following decades a period of luxuriant harvest. America, in its every-day mood, is more alive with Christian enthusiasm now than ever before. The century, from 1800 to 1880, had seen brought into the churches 9,701,091, more than one third of whom had been converted during the previous decade. The increase in population had been in the proportion of nine and a half to one ; of church membership, twenty-seven and a half. In 1800 there was one church-member to fifteen of the population ; in 1880, one to five.

WANTED—AN EXPLANATION.

How shall we account for the marked difference between the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries in respect of persistent evangelical power ? Shall we refer it by wholesale to the divine sovereignty ? So does the Mussulman solve all questions by an appeal to fate and the will of Allah. The divine sovereignty uses methods, and the method in this instance, it seems to me, has been that of an increased intelligence. In quality of thought and of moral feeling nothing can surpass the day of Jonathan Edwards. A nobler, richer mind has not appeared since Augustine. In keenness of intellect and in comprehensiveness he is unsurpassable. Yet, while the logic and the metaphysical acumen of that age were of the highest order, there was room for great improvement in practical intelligence. Men had to learn that Edwards had not summed up all wisdom as to the human will, although his logic was unimpeachable. They had to learn that there are more direct ways of reaching the souls of men for their everlasting good than by the splitting of hairs and the constructing of systems of metaphysical theology. They had to un-learn the morbid dread that they might do something that would interfere with the sovereignty of God. They had to learn that from the lowest point of creation to the very throne of God there is a continuous ascent, not broken by an abrupt cleavage, which separates the natural from the supernatural; that, therefore, Christianity is the religion of nature. Within the century the Baconian method has been urging its way into the midst of all religious thinking and activity, modifying theology and theories of inspiration, and forcing attention to Jesus Christ as the sum of the religion of the Bible. The Christianity of to-day, without the loss of any share of its divine element, is infinitely more human and correspondingly more effective than that of a hundred years ago.

In one most important respect the point of view has shifted. Dr. A. J. Gordon has called attention to the fact that every religious movement that constitutes a historical epoch has at the heart of it a great idea. In Wickliffe's day the central thought was—the Bible the only authority. In Luther's day it was—justification by faith alone. In Wesley's day, the day of Jonathan Edwards, it was—the witness of the Spirit, bringing a conscious sense that one is a child of God. In our day it is—an objective salvation, a redemption, completed in a crucified and risen Saviour. Through the centuries the Christian world has been working its way to this, the simplest truth of the gospel, the glad tidings which was the power of the preaching of the apostles. Subjectivism in religion breeds mysticism. Introversion breeds morbidness and spiritual egotism. The soul is saved, not by self-examination, by feelings and experience, but by hearing the Lord, crucified and risen, cry with a loud voice to the dead, "Come forth," and by obeying. It is this truth, a completed redemption offered for the sinner's acceptance, that gives to the evangelism of to-day its vitality, and is promising to convert the world.

RESULTS OF EVANGELISM.

But that which constitutes the crowning glory of this period I have not yet touched. Out of the heart of this national evangelical movement sprang the great organizations which have done, and are still doing, so much to promote the spread of Christianity. Sunday-school unions, missionary boards, Bible societies, tract societies, and various other associations for organized Christian effort are the direct offspring of the revival spirit. In the extensive revivals which marked the opening of the century, many of the most noted missionaries were converted —Hall, Newell, Mills, Judson, Nott, Rice, Bingham, King, Thurston, and others. This spirit of revival, in England as well as in America, set in movement the forces which have caused the Bible to be translated into more than two hundred and fifty languages, while heathen lands and isles of the sea are dotted with Christian churches and communities. Surely these great events entitle the hundred years that have passed to be characterized as among the most remarkable since the days of the apostles.

It would be interesting to discuss the lives and characteristics of the great evangelists whom this period has developed—Nettleton, Finney, Knapp, Kirk, Moody, etc. But space is lacking.

The relation of all this to the welfare of our country, its influence upon our destiny and the future of the world, is a topic also forcibly suggested. The magnificent purpose and providence of God can be easily recognized in these special workings of his power in America.

Certainly the conclusion of a century so memorable is worthy of special commemoration. Assuming Dr. Fish's statements to be correct, and I see no reason to question them, bearing in mind also that there were revivals not only among the Baptists of Boston, in 1790, but in Western Pennsylvania, and Southwestern Virginia as well, why shall we not regard the year that is now drawing to a close as the proper centenary?

Cincinnati, December, 1890.

THE MONTH'S MIND.

Another contested will. The heirs of the late Elizabeth Perkins Fogg, the widow of a merchant of this city who died about seven years ago, are dissatisfied with the disposition that she made of her estate. She devised about six hundred thousand dollars to various institutions of learning and charity, of which $200,000 was given for the establishment of an art museum in connection with Harvard University. Not much has been published regarding the reasons that the heirs allege for their dissatisfaction, but the reasons are scarcely material to any but themselves. The general question whether it is good policy to encourage or even to permit these contests is not seriously affected by the details of this particular case. In fact, the case is of interest chiefly as emphasizing the conviction, rapidly gaining ground among the thoughtful portion of the community, that something must be done to prevent the scandal of these increasingly frequent contests. Two views are possible with regard to the testamentary disposition of property, and only two. A testator in sound mind either has or has not the right to decide what shall be done with his property after his death. There is much plausibility in the theory advanced by some that no man has a right to make testamentary provision for the disposition of his property. While a man lives what he has is his own to do with whatsoever he may please; when he dies it is no longer his. He cannot take it out of the world with him, and he has no moral right to decide what shall become of it. He has had it, he has enjoyed it, he is done with it, and now it is for society and not for him to say who shall enjoy it next. Such, we say, is the theory, certainly not without plausibility, of some. But if we reject this theory, as society at present does, in favor of the view that a man has a right to say what shall be done with his property when he has himself ceased to enjoy it, the right should be respected and protected. A system that acknowledges the right and pretends to secure it, while yet it makes it practically impossible for a person of wealth to dispose of his property according to his desire, is certainly an anomalous condition of things. There is no satisfactory half-way house between the denial of testamentary rights and the effectual granting of them. As the case stands at present, no man who is worth enough to make it any object for his heirs to quarrel over his estate can make a will with any certainty that its provisions will be sustained by the courts. This condition of things imposes upon Christian men the duty of being their own executors. Some shrewd and far-seeing men of business have acted upon it. A man of this stamp died only a few days ago. John B. Trevor had been for forty years a well-known business man in Wall Street, where by his shrewdness and probity he had accumulated a large fortune. It was a surprise to some of his friends—not altogether an agreeable one, perhaps—to find that in his will he made few bequests to religious, or charitable, or educational organizations, and these few were trifling in amount. But those who knew anything of his history were aware that during the past twenty years he has been a large and constant giver to educational and religious enterprises. The amount that he has thus given, if it had been bestowed in one sum by will, would have been considered a very handsome proportion of the fortune that he bequeathed to his heirs. But he chose the better part of giving during his lifetime, while he was able to see the results of his beneficence, and to direct it into the best channels. Moreover, his giving was in many instances so wisely timed as to stimulate the gifts of others; and as a result, it is hardly exaggerating the fact to say, the two institutions of learning that were his chief beneficiaries received, as a direct result of his gifts, two dollars from others for every dollar that he gave. That benefactions bestowed in this way are a wiser form of benevolence than the reluctant bestowal of a small part of that which death is about to wring from one's hands, it will require little argument to convince the judicious.

⁂

It is possible now to form an opinion as to the value of the work done by Father Ignatius, O. B. M., which being interpreted is Order of Benedictine Monks. His "mission" was a nine-days' wonder, hardly that, and then it ceased to attract attention, even in novelty-loving New York. The preacher could not claim the privilege of martyrdom in New York, because the bishop of the diocese had given him a license to preach, but the license was worthless unless rectors would invite him into their pulpits. The Father's preaching soon ceased to attract the crowd. As a sensation the mission was of the mildest character, and its duration was correspondingly brief. What helped, perhaps, as powerfully as anything to kill it was the mendicancy of the preacher, who stationed himself at the door, in monkish fashion, to solicit alms of all the congregation for his monastery. This sort of thing may impress Americans as very picturesque when they are travelling abroad, but they have no use for it at home. In short, the mission contained all the elements of failure and none of the elements of success. The Father has now begun a similar work in Brooklyn, and as Bishop Littlejohn has followed the example of Bishop Paddock in refusing him a license, he will be able again to pose as a martyr.

⁂

As we write these words the probabilities are that the Indian troubles will be over in a few hours. They ought never to have occurred. Evidence has recently transpired that is ample to establish the culpability of the United States Government in permitting matters to come to such an extremity. So long ago as the spring of 1890, information was conveyed by official inspectors to the

United States authorities at Washington that the Indians had not received the supplies of food to which they were entitled under the treaties made with them ; that they had been obliged to kill their domestic stock to supply their wants ; that their crops were likely to prove a failure ; and that the fall and winter would see them reduced to the verge of starvation and desperation. Still nothing was done. It is too soon accurately to apportion the blame for this inaction. The situation has been aggravated by the removal during the past year of old and experienced Indian agents at many of the reservations, and the appointment, for political reasons, of new and untried men. What with violation of treaties by the Government and lack of tact and coolness on the part of officials on the spot, the situation rapidly became worse, until a most serious outbreak was inevitable. The influence of the Messiah craze in producing the disturbance has doubtless been greatly exaggerated. It was shrewdly utilized by a few crafty chiefs like Sitting Bull, because it afforded them a means of prosecuting their own designs, but it had no real part in producing the dissaffection of the Indians, or in causing their revolt. There can be no question that the grievance of the Indians is a genuine one. The story of the wrongs of this race is a long one, and forms a most disgraceful chapter in the history of our country. We are in this respect no better than our sires ; on the contrary, we are continuing to the best of our ability the policy of mingled fraud and violence that disgraces the past.

⁂

THE University of Chicago, to which allusion has already been made in these notes as an institution that will begin its career with an endowment of at least two-and-a-half millions, will be organized upon a plan that is novel in many of its particulars. It will justify its title of university by providing for graduate instruction in schools of divinity, law, medicine, engineering, pedagogy, fine arts and music as rapidly as these various schools can be established. In the mean time, it will not neglect to provide what is yet more needed in the West, undergraduate instruction. It will do this, not by means of one college with varied courses of study, but by establishing a group of colleges, each providing instruction in what Harvard and Yale denominate "courses." There will be, for example, a college of liberal arts, a college of science, a college of literature and a college of practical arts, and others may be added. This combination of the European university and the American college will, in itself, be to some extent a novelty, but the system of instruction is an even greater departure from all established precedents. The year will be divided into four equal quarters of two terms each, with one week vacation between the terms. A student may enter at the beginning of either quarter, and he may take a vacation of one quarter in any part of the year. By pursuing his studies the year round, taking only the vacations between terms, he may finish his course and take his degree in three years, or if he chooses he may take more than four years to complete the course. If he is obliged to support himself, in whole or in part, he can select for his vacation that portion of the year when his labor will be most profitable to himself. Studies will be divided into "majors" and "minors," a major being so called because a student devotes two hours of recitation a day to that study and to a minor one. He will take a major and a minor in each term. This concentration of labor, it is believed, will enable students to do more and better work than if their attention was frittered away by division among a large number of studies. The student's standing will be determined by his term grade in the class-room work and by two examinations, one passed at the conclusion of the term and the other twelve weeks later. If his standing is sufficiently high, he will not be required to take the first examination, and for the second he may substitute new material in the same department equal in amount to one quarter of the term's work. It is believed that this method will avoid the dangers and abuses of the examination system, since it offers every inducement to do solid work, and discourages cram. When we add to this that no student will be admitted on certificate, but must pass an examination, and that no honorary degree will be conferred, it is evident that we have outlined a system of education having many new and attractive features. It has received the commendation of educational authorities of the highest rank, and its practical operation will be watched with the greatest interest. The work of professors is regulated on a plan equally novel and praiseworthy. Each professor is required to lecture thirty-six weeks, ten to twelve hours a week, and is entitled to a vacation of twelve weeks at any time in the year, as he may arrange with the dean of his college or school. By arrangement he may lecture beyond this requirement, receiving therefor a *pro rata* addition either to pay or vacation. By lecturing three years of forty-eight weeks each, or six years of forty-two weeks each, he becomes entitled to a year's leave of absence on full pay. A professor will thereby, without overtaxing himself to obtain it, have at least every seventh year to travel and study abroad, or in any other way to perfect himself in his own department. In addition to the work of the university thus far described, there is to be a department of publication that will issue bulletins of information, books and essays written by the faculty and students of the university. Other features of the plan are university extension by means of evening courses on college and university subjects, delivered by professors in and about Chicago for the benefit of men and women engaged during the day; correspondence courses for students in all parts of the country; special courses at the university in the scientific study of the Bible; and still further avenues of usefulness may be expected to open when the institution has been fairly established. There has certainly been no plan proposed in the recent history of American educational institutions that has awakened more hopeful interest than this.

* * *

THE country has had such a surfeit of heresy trials that, for the most part, little attention is paid to the doings of ecclesiastical tribunals. We have noted, within the past month, a half-dozen cases of this sort, and in only one instance have the daily newspapers considered them worth more than a "stickful" of type. The case of the Rev. Howard MacQueary must be allowed to be exceptionally important. The issue that he had deliberately chosen to make was nothing less than the binding authority of the fundamentals of the Christian faith. Mr. MacQueary denied the inerrancy of the Scriptures, the incarnation and resurrection of Christ (in any material sense), and in general eliminated the supernatural element from Christianity. It is true that he maintained his belief in the incarnation and resurrection, in miracle and the supernatural, in a sense of his own; but he did not profess to hold these truths as they are taught in the Articles of Religion and the liturgy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, of which he is a presbyter. He was not content with preaching these things in the comparative privacy of a country parish, in which case the offence might have been condoned because of its obscurity, but he printed them in a book and sent it forth for the world to read. Such a challenge could not be disregarded by any self-respecting church, unless it was willing at once to proclaim to the world that its clergy might deny anything without fear of molestation. Mr. MacQueary having thrown his glove into the arena, the Bishop of Ohio had no choice but to take it up, and a trial for heresy necessarily followed. The facts were beyond dispute; all the evidence was documentary on both sides; the question resolved itself into one of church law. The argument of the accused was ingenious. He held that he had performed his duty according to his ordination vows, which bound him to test the creeds by the Scriptures and to follow the latter. He further held that he had departed no further from the faith than many clergymen of his church who are tolerated, and offered in evidence a sermon by a well-known and erratic churchman of New York. Pending the decision of the court, there is an obvious propriety in closing our review of the case at this point.

* * *

SINCE the delivery of the judgment in the case of the Bishop of Lincoln, the extreme ritualists have followed the example of that prelate in omitting the sign of the cross in the absolution, the mixing of the chalice before the people, and other observances declared illegal. The Primate has made an unofficial suggestion of a *modus vivendi* in those parishes where an ornate ritual is observed, contrary to the wishes of a considerable part of the people. The archbishop declares that in such cases it is the bounden duty of the clergy, wherever an elaborate ceremonial is the rule, to provide at the most convenient hours, "especially on the first Sunday in the month and at the most frequented hour, administrations of the Holy Communion which shall meet in all ways the desire of those parishioners whose sense of devotion seeks and feeds on the plain and quiet solemnities in which they have been reared, which they love, and in which their souls most perfectly 'go in and out and find pasture.'" This novel idea of a double "use" in the same parish has the merit of giving due weight to the conscientious scruples of communicants, but does it give weight enough to the conscientious convictions of the incumbent, supposing that he has any?

* * *

AN interesting experiment in denominational co-operation is now fairly under way in Maine, and its results will be noted with interest by all Christians. There is nothing more doleful in the New England village than six struggling churches where there is room, at most, for two. The same duplication of churches has more or less characterized the newer States as they have been settled, and is even now going on in the newest sections of the West. Frantic appeals are made to denominational pride not to be left behind in the race for occupying the most desirable towns. Chapels and churches are built by misguided people in the East far in advance of the wants of the people, not for the glory of God, but for the glory of this or that church. All religious bodies are about equally sinners in this policy, or if any one is less a sinner, the fact is due to poverty rather than to superior virtue. It is fitting that from New England, where this kind of denominationalism has gone to seed, should come a movement for reform—a conference representing Congregationalists, Methodists, Baptists, Free Baptists and Christians. After a free interchange of opinion, it was voted as their judgment that the churches ought to co-operate according to the plans of the Evangelical Alliance; that missionary work ought to be carried on in the same spirit; that there should be frequent conferences by official representatives of missionary organizations for this purpose; and that the four denominations represented be requested to appoint delegates at their next annual meetings to confer further as to ways and means of co-operation. "Ways and means" will present little difficulty to those who are actuated by this spirit. In nothing is the old adage truer than in denominational co-operation—where there's a will there's a way. We look to see important practical results follow the honest application of the principles thus enunciated to church work in the smaller towns of Maine. There may be much real religious destitution in a place where churches abound.

* * *

That was a happy thought of a Brooklyn citizen, a man of substance and (one hopes) a Christian also, to erect his wife's monument in the form of a building devoted to the uses of the Young Women's Christian Association of the City of Churches. In Mrs. Helen O. Wood that institution lost one of its devoted friends, but a husband worthy of such a woman survived her, and continues her work. The sum of $125,000 is pledged for this building, an amount ample to ensure a large, solid, well-appointed structure; and the association is fortunate in possessing a fine site, the gift of a previous benefactor, the late S. B. Chittenden. The sole condition of the gift is that other friends of the association shall provide an endowment fund of $100,000, to provide for the care of the property and the carrying on of the general work. That the endowment will be given cannot be doubted. This work is henceforth solidly based, and will go on with ever-increasing sweep of beneficence. There can be no longer question, as there was for a time in the minds of some, whether Christian Associations for young women are needed. Nothing succeeds like success, and the success of the Association in New York and Brooklyn ought to lead to the founding of branches in other large cities.

* * *

The scheme for the relief and reformation of the outcast portion of England, outlined in General Booth's book *In Darkest England*, meets with less favor the more it is analyzed and weighed. The character of General Booth and the nature of his organization are now clearly seen to be factors in the problem that cannot be overlooked. The probable character of his successor and the future of the Salvation Army must also be taken into account. The sentimental side of the book, with its adroit appeals to the sympathies, had a powerful effect at first, an effect that from the nature of the case spent itself at once. Effusive responses of interest and good will came immediately from many sources, with the addition of not a few noted names, but hard cash came in slowly, and soon may not come in at all. As the scheme is subjected to keen scrutiny, the doubt grows whether it is sound, and also whether, if sound, General Booth can be trusted to administer it. The "balance sheets" issued periodically from the headquarters of the Army show that the financial management of that body is queer, to say the least. Funds that should be kept carefully separate, and conscientiously applied to the purposes for which they are contributed, have been "pooled" in a common fund, from which the Army's expenses must first be paid. The danger is that the money contributed by confiding persons for the benevolent work of the Army will be converted to the support of what Mr. Huxley wittily calls "corybantic Christianity." The withdrawal from the Army of the man who is generally believed to have been the life and soul of the social reform work of the Army, and the inspirer of the best parts of the book of which the General was but the putative author, does not tend to strengthen confidence in the scheme.

* * *

One of the consequences of holding the Columbian Exposition in Chicago is likely to be an almost complete secularization of the Lord's Day throughout the West, and to a less degree its secularization in every part of the United States. The influx of foreign visitors will be considerable, and still larger will be the number of visitors who are nominally Americans, but are really foreigners. Those who bring Germany, or France, or Italy with them when they come to this country to find freedom denied them where they were born, what are they but foreigners, even though they have gone through the forms of naturalization, and can cast a ballot with the best of us? These foreigners have no love for the Sabbath of America. They love the Continental Sunday, with its feasting and merry-making, its junketing and visiting, its bands of music and its beer-gardens. This will be the American Sunday of a generation hence, unless Christian people bestir themselves. Indeed, we sometimes wonder whether it is not too late to withstand successfully the drift in this direction. At any rate, we have little hope that the Columbian Exposition can be closed on Sunday, though it is well that various Christian organizations are using all their influence to that end. The Commissioners are likely to feel most strongly the pressure of local influence, and that influence will be overwhelmingly in favor of the Sunday opening of the grounds and buildings. Something might be hoped for through the intervention of Congress, but a canvass of that body shows it to be too evenly divided to make such action at all probable. This probable disregard of Sunday as a day of rest during the continuance of the Exposition is as much to be regretted for hygienic and moral reasons as on religious grounds. To the Christian it is, of course, nothing less than desecration of a sacred day. To the enlightened statesman, whether Christian or not, it is the destruction of a beneficent social institution. The need of a periodic rest-day is written in the physical and moral constitution of man; and violation of that law will be followed by the inevitable penalty, deterioration. The American State, in making laws regarding the observance of Sunday, cannot take into account its sacred character in the eyes of some; but it can and does take account of its necessity to all for the maintenance of physical and moral health. The practical abrogation of the laws providing for rest from ordinary labor on Sunday, if it shall prove to be an abrogation and not merely a suspension, will certainly have grave consequences on the character of the American people of the twentieth century.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

A Class-Book of Biblical History and Geography. With numerous maps. By Professor H. S. Osborn, LL.D. New York: American Tract Society, 1890. 12mo, pp. 312, $1.25.

This volume is tastefully printed from new type, and it is easy to find any topic that is treated in its chronological order on account of the use of heavy-faced type by which the introduction of each subject is noted. The author has attempted to outline the history of the biblical books, and in so doing he has followed the order of the books more or less closely. From the Preface one is led to expect to find some treatment of the interval between the close of the Old Testament Canon and the birth of Christ, but in vain. What is there said has no reference to the external history of the Jewish people, but only to the growth of their traditions and learning based on the Old Testament Scriptures, as embodied in the Talmud. The Maccabees do not come in for even passing mention. The history of the Old Testament, with some notice of the nations surrounding Israel, the life of Christ and the history of the Apostolic Church are treated in brief sections and in terse, short sentences. The author has purposed to exclude all matter of speculation, and has endeavored to confine himself to the statement of pure fact. He has succeeded in making a book that may be of value to teachers in Sabbath-schools and to the pupils in Bible-classes, but it will scarcely prove itself of prime importance to ministers or theological students, except as giving a very brief statement of some of the facts in the case.

Exception may be taken to some of the statements as being loose or misleading. One of these is on page 86, where it is said, "The treasure city Pithom, mentioned with Rameses in the first chapter of Exodus (verse 11), was in Succoth, as a recent discovery has shown." Succoth and Pithom were the civil and religious name of one and the same place. In this same connection it may be remarked that the map of "Sinai and the Desert of the Wanderings," at the close of the volume, is not at all in accord with the text. It is an old map made years ago, before the explorations of the Egypt Fund cleared up what had always been an obscure point. It represents Pithom at the western end of the Wadi Tumilat, near Heliopolis, with Rameses half way between it and the line of the Suez Canal. Heroöpolis again is placed between Rameses and the canal, while Succoth-Etham is on the Bitter Lakes! It is surprising that such locations should have been allowed to remain. The fact is that Succoth, Pithom, and Heroöpolis were names that attached to the same place at different periods, and that place was located about eleven miles from the Suez Canal in the Wadi Tumilat. If one will compare the narrative of the first days of the Exodus with this map, one will be led to favor the old tradition as to the place of crossing the Red Sea, perhaps; but the facts, as revealed by later investigation, make the acceptance of that theory much more difficult. The distance from the real Succoth to Suez is far too great to have been traversed by such a multitude as that which accompanied Moses in the time allotted to the journey.

The sentence on page 57, "During this period fortifications were erected on the northeastern frontier of Egypt, which appear to have extended across the whole of the present isthmus of Suez (Socin).

The term Shur, used six times in Scripture, is now supposed to refer to this 'wall.' " If by "wall" is meant a continuous structure, the statement is certainly not probable or in accordance with the well-known facts derived from Egyptian monuments and papyri. That there was a succession of forts and defences against incursions by dwellers in the desert, has been admitted all along, but a "wall" is not proved to have existed, and is more than doubtful.

It is a pity that the book has no index. If one wishes to read it rapidly, to get a quick survey of the field, it may be done with a varying degree of satisfaction; but for a book of reference, the volume has far less of value than it might have had if it had contained a full index.

C. R. GILLETT.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

WENDELL PHILLIPS, THE AGITATOR. With an Appendix containing three of the Orator's Masterpieces, never before published in book form, viz., "The Lost Arts," "Daniel O'Connell," "The Scholar in a Republic." By CARLOS MARTYN, D.D. (Forming Vol. I. of "American Reformers," a series of twelve biographies, edited by Carlos Martyn, D.D.) New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1890. 12mo, 600 pp., cloth, $1.50.

A great subject is here treated by one who brings to his task enthusiasm and warm appreciation, but who lacks somewhat the gifts of style and artistic taste. It is possible that much of that which seems thus lacking in refinement of thought and nicety of expression is purposely made so by the author, in order to attract attention and impress his thought. But it is to be regretted that the proprieties of the case were not more carefully observed, and the life of the most finished orator of America given with as faultless a style as could be brought to the task. The author has gathered with great diligence the significant facts of Phillips's life and times, and has interpreted these facts sympathetically and, on the whole, with genuine force and insight. Not a little of interest and value is gained by permitting Phillips to speak for himself on every important theme. Those rare days of the Anti-Slavery agitation of which Phillips was the almost inspired orator and leader, "the brave days of old," are made to live before us with all their stir, and high aspirations, and dramatic crises. No one can read these pages without being impressed anew and profoundly by the deep meanings and glorious issues with which those decades were instinct; and the author's unconcealed admiration for the character and genius and influence of the great man he sets before us, becomes contagious. After all needful discounts have been made, we cannot fail to reckon Phillips an exceptional and providential man, in gifts and career, raised up for the times on which he fell and for the glorious work he wrought, as truly as Luther, or Cromwell, or Lincoln. His unique position, outside of political parties and in free criticism of whatever cause came before him, will always seem to some seriously to modify the value of his example and the weight of his influence; while to many this fact will rather be taken as an intrinsic part of the career and service he was providentially called to achieve, a striking proof of the rare elevation and unselfishness of his character. The steadfast faith in God and loyalty to His Word which so strikingly characterize this man and distinguish him from many of his associates, are never to be forgotten or overlooked. This is a life and character which form an intrinsic part of the nation's wealth, and which we may wish all our youth should know and admire and gather hence a stronger impulse toward the brave, unselfish spirit and heroic deeds which redeem manhood from littleness and the age from shame. Defects in this man there undoubtedly were; mistakes he certainly made; none knew this better than himself. But in the galaxy of great and gifted men who belong to this century, and whose names are forever associated with the struggle for liberty which culminated in the War for the Union and the enfranchisement of the freedmen, not one will be found more pure in life, more exalted in aim, or more worthy of lasting remembrance than Wendell Phillips, the great Orator of the Anti-Slavery cause.

JUDSON SMITH.

BOSTON, MASS.

THE OLD DOCUMENTS AND THE NEW BIBLE. An easy lesson for the people in Biblical Criticism. By J. PATERSON SMYTH, LL.B., B.D. The Old Testament. James Pott & Co., New York. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, Limited. Pp. xvi. and 216. $1.00.

This little book is a well-meant attempt to introduce the English reader to the mysteries of Biblical Criticism. The criticism treated, however, is not the literary criticism, or higher criticism of the Old Testament. The author devotes himself altogether to the subject of criticism of the text. The title is especially misleading, because by "documents" we now so generally understand the works from which many biblical books were compiled, and into which we may analyze them. He who goes to the book before us for light on questions of internal criticism will be disappointed. It may be useful, however, to any one who wishes to know what the process of transmission has been.

The writer treats the Hebrew writing in two chapters, and then defines Biblical (*i.e.*, Textual) Criticism. He gives some account of the Hebrew manuscripts and of the Massoretes. The Samaritan Pentateuch, the Talmud and Targums, the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate are each treated in a chapter, and some specimens of criticism, as seen in the work of the revisers, are given. Several facsimiles adorn the work.

The critic of this criticism will put a query opposite some statements. Why should the Shapira incident be recounted afresh? Is it true that "Not one of the good fathers of the Council of Trent knew a word of Hebrew?" Why should it be thought "curious" that Josephus, who wrote in Greek, should occasionally be influenced by the LXX.? Can it fairly be said that "quotations from the Bible in ancient Jewish commentaries" are real sources for criticism of the text?

Misleading is the account of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotian in that it does not emphasize the extremely fragmentary character of what has come down to us of these versions. The author thinks "Jerome had probably manuscripts before him of an earlier date than the days of our Lord," but gives no evidence for the opinion. He assumes much, indeed, for which there is no evidence, as that, in Samuel's day, the Law at least, "would naturally be kept with the Ark in Shiloh." He asserts that all Samuel's teaching was "based upon these Scripture records, and probably that the knowledge of them might be preserved and disseminated he founded his theological colleges or Schools of the Prophets." Further we read that two of the oldest of the prophetical books, Hosea and Jonah, were the work of men trained in the schools of Elijah, and afterward no writing was received as inspired unless it could claim a prophet for its author. It must be evident to any one acquainted with the facts, that all these assertions are quite beyond the evidence at our command. Severe self-restraint is important for the critic above almost all other men.

HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.
LANE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
CINCINNATI, O.

PRAKTISCHE THEOLOGIE, von Dr. E. CHR. ACHELIS, Prof. an der Universität Marburg. Erster Band: Einleitung; Die Lehre von der Kirche und ihren Aemtern; Katechetik; Homiletik; Poimenik. Freiburg i.-B.: Mohr. New York: Stechert, 1890. Pp. xvi., 549. 8vo, 2 mk.

A work of high order of excellence, wrought out on the basis of Lutheran doctrine and cultus, intended, when complete, to cover all departments of Practical Theology, possessing the thoroughness, completeness, and critical accuracy which characterize German authorship, and free from any traces of unbelief or rationalism. The Introduction is historical. It traces the opinions respecting Practical Theology held in past ages, onward to Schleiermacher; then lays stress on the service rendered this branch of study by Schleiermacher and Nitzsch.

Practical Theology is defined to be "none other than the Doctrine respecting the activity of the Church for her own edification" (p. 25). This includes missionary work at home and in foreign lands (pp. 16–18).

The entire material is treated in six Books: I. The Church and her Offices; II. The Holy Activity of the Church in three subdivisions: regarding children and youth (Catechetics); regarding the adult membership (Homiletics); and regarding single individuals among youth and adults, or the special cure of souls (Poimenics); III. The authorized Offices of Cultus (Liturgics); IV. Public Worship; V. Voluntary associations in the interest of missions, home and foreign; and VI. The doctrine of Church Government (p. 29). This first volume contains only two Books.

The entire treatment proceeds on the principle that it is the vocation of the Church to hold fast the truth committed to her trust by Christ, and to actualize the Christian salvation in all her members; so that what the Church is in idea she may become in reality, a *holy* communion.

The Church is the community of believers, all of whom are priests and kings. Ministers are the representatives of believers; ordination sets them apart for the performance of particular acts in the service of the congregation (pp. 110, 112); the line being sharply drawn between the Roman Catholic and the Evangelical conception of the ministry.

Each Book opens with a history of the Doctrine treated, beginning with the post-Apostolic age; and it is accompanied with an irenical criticism of divergent opinions. So of the three subdivisions of Book second, which gives a succinct history of Catechetics, Homiletics, and Pastoral Theology (Poimenics); including the ministry, infant baptism, catechization, confirmation, the sermon and homily, preaching, the preacher, public prayer, administration of sacraments, confession, absolution, the pastor, pastoral visitation, with all phases of ministerial and pastoral work, not omitting details as to dress, deportment at weddings, and the beard (p. 470). The oldest work on Homiletics is the Fourth Book of *Christian Doctrine*, by Augustine. The end of oratory according to Cicero is threefold: docere, delectare, flectare (movere), which Augustine improves by maintaining that the end of preaching is but *one*: ut veritas probet, veritas placeat, veritas moveat (pp. 281, 343).

This work, when finished, will be a valuable contribution to Practical Theology; more comprehensive, more minute (blending the theoretical and practical), than anything of the sort extant in English. Its criticisms are judicious; the historical portion is developed from the sources; and the entire discussion is earnest, evangelical, dignified, and pervaded throughout by fidelity to Christ and devotion to the kingdom of God.

E. V. GERHART.
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, REFORMED CHURCH,
LANCASTER, PA.

ZWINGLI'S THEOLOGIE. Ihr Werden und ihr System dargestellt von AUGUST BAUR, Dr. Theol. Halle: Max Niemeyer. New York: Stechert. Vol. I., pp. viii., 543, 1885; Vol. II., pp. x., 864, 1889. Large 8vo. 9 mk.

Inspired by the example of Köstlin and of Herrlinger, who have given us accounts of the development of the theologies of Luther and Melanchthon, respectively, Baur has sought in this volume to trace minutely, through all the steps of his career, the growth of Zwingli's theological ideas, and then to review them summarily in systematic form, as far as the preceding work has not rendered this superfluous. He thus passes in review, first, the period in which Zwingli was gaining his general education at Wesen, Basel, and Bern, in which the contributions of Humanism to the progress of the future Reformer appear even more clearly than in the case of Luther. From his closing studies at Vienna, Zwingli passed to the position of a teacher at Basel, and at the same time began the study of theology. The next period, from Basel to Zurich, while he was at Glarus and Einsiedeln as pastor and preacher, was a time of further study, in which he became acquainted not only with the Greek New Testament, which gave the Biblical character to his work afterward so marked, but also with the history of the heresies of the Middle Ages. His dependence upon Erasmus is brought out by Baur with new force. He stood in close connection with all the movements of his time, reading the letters of the "obscure men," and thus taking part in all the preparatory contests of the day. Arrived in Zurich, he began his labors, and for a time was absorbed in the regular preaching of the Word, which he founded upon the text of the New Testament. He had already taken position with respect to Luther, whom he regarded as the noble protagonist of the Reformation, but whose tumultuous ways were in entire contrast with his own more quiet and regular advance in the knowledge of the truth.

With the first disputation in Zurich begins the more characteristic portion of the book, the portion which contains, in intimate connection with the account of each event, the fullest analysis of the works written by Zwingli, in which the processes of his mind are so clearly presented that a knowledge of them is a knowledge of Zwingli himself. In fact, Baur from this point may be said to have given us a *résumé*, mostly in the very words of Zwingli, of his entire works, making their perusal, except for the scholar in pursuit of the most minute knowledge, quite unnecessary. It is interesting to note that in his first occasional publication, "Von Erkiesen und Freiheit der Speisen" Zwingli covered essentially the whole outline of Christian theology. The chief thought brought out was the freedom of the Church under the Gospel from the prescriptions of men. This was a rupture with the Papal Church, and was completed in the "Archeteles." and then Zwingli advanced to the defence of the "clearness" of the word of God, and to an attack upon the worship paid to the Virgin. To the term "Gospel" he already gave that broad signification which made it include "all which has made men certain of the will of God."

With the close of the two disputations at Zurich, Zwingli found himself in possession of a scheme of theology which he embodied in his "Commentary of True and False Religion." Marked by certain liberal tendencies, as it was, it nevertheless based theology upon a conception of God's providence which robbed all second causes of reality. Predestination was absolute, and all freedom of the will was absolutely denied. In this he agreed formally with Luther, and doubtless in both cases their antagonism to the prevailing semi-Pelagianism of Rome decided their theological view. But Luther was as practical in this matter as Zwingli was philosophical. The progress of events soon hurried the two reformers into that contest upon the sacrament which was to consume so much of their time and to leave them and their followers separated into two hostile camps. Baur makes it very clear that the difference sprang from a fundamental difference as to the general view (*reformatorische Anschauung*) which they had of theology and of their proper work. Luther made his experience of Christian truth the proximate source of his doctrine, though the Scriptures were the supreme source. In the matter of the sacrament he was so involved in conceptions of grace in relation to the Eucharist that he was scarcely able to come to the text of the Scriptures with complete candor of mind. Zwingli, on the contrary, derived his view much more objectively from the Bible. Baur vindicates the originality of Zwingli's form of conceiving the doctrine against those who have referred it to the communication of Hoen. The great conscientiousness of our author is worthy at this point of special commendation, for he has traced the statement of Zwingli's opinions through all the various treatises in which they are found, most minutely. Thus he brings us to the contest with Luther in person, both by tract and at Marburg, through all the previous discussion where Zwingli had avoided bringing in Luther's personality.

The great body of the work is occupied with these detailed studies; but in the last hundred pages, Baur discusses the theological system of Zwingli. In opposition to the mediæval view which the Roman Church held, his was humanistic, which appeared particularly in the emphasis he laid upon the Bible; but it was not aristocratic, like humanism in general, but rather animated by a true sympathy with the people. It was also strictly evangelical, which humanism was not, and viewed the Gospel as the revelation of salvation through Jesus Christ, basing its conceptions upon the objective revelation in the Scriptures. Faith was to Zwingli a highly spiritual process, which was not attached to anything sensuous, and needed no sensuous means of communication. Hence his objections to the Lutheran doctrine of the Supper, and to the doctrine of free-will, which he viewed as the source of the system of salvation by works which pervaded the Roman Church. There is no attempt made by Baur to describe the system of Zwingli in consecutive and developed form. Zwingli never wrote anything which can be regarded as a full development of it. But the different types of his systematic presentations are reviewed, as in the 67 *Schlussreden* where the three great points of view are (1) The Gospel as the only source of salvation; (2) Christ the only Saviour, divinely sent; (3) The Church as the visible and invisible communion within which there is salvation. In the "Christliche Einleitung" the point of view adopted is the antithesis of sin and grace, law and gospel. These views are combined in the "Commentarius." Thus, as a whole, Zwingli is shown to be the leader of that tendency which has maintained itself in the Reformed churches to this day, to make the Scriptures eminently the source of Christian doctrine and to hold radically to the type of religious life presented there, though without converting them into a new law.

We have already said enough of the characteristics of the work to spare our readers further words of praise. In general it may be said to be a faithful digest of Zwingli's complete works.

F. H. FOSTER.

OBERLIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

DAS LUKAS-EVANGELIUM UND DIE APOSTELGESCHICHTE, WERKE DESSELBEN VERFASSERS. Von J. FRIEDRICH. Halle a. S.: Kaemmerer, 1890. Pp. ii., 104. 8vo.

This little book is an excellent example of the microscopic character of German study. An acknowledged help in the author's examination is Bruder's Concordance, and out of 103 pages of text, 62 are devoted to the material gained from the employment of that work. In this part are considered the usages of individual words, words found in Luke's Gospel and in the Acts and not elsewhere, circumlocutions, stylistic peculiarities, resemblances in particular sentences in the two books, and the words used in the introduction to the Acts. The rest of the examination is concerned with the resemblance of certain parts of the subject matter of the Gospel and the Acts, treated under twenty-four heads. Mention of these will show the scope of the book. They are: the manner of relating circumstances attending the Ascension, the catalogue of the Apostles, the trial and death of Jesus and Stephen, appearances of angels, the opposition of wealth and poverty, the parallels of the substitution of Paul for Saul, and of Peter for Simon in the Acts and in the Gospel, the author's fondness for speaking of kings and exalted personages, the rush of the people to see and hear Jesus and Paul, the frequency of prayers in both books, narratives of accomplished deeds and experiences, resemblances in conduct in Peter and Paul, Luke's personal character, the double mention of names (as in "Jerusalem, Jerusalem"), narratives of weeping, blind and lame beggars, wonder-working causes, fear and praise of God, mention of pantomime (Winken) and of eating and drinking, fondness in both books for mention of brightness and lightning, specification of the language of a speaker, observance of the Mosaic law, Luke's treatment of the Gentiles, the motive of a miracle (*e.g.*, the *only* daughter of Jairus was healed), and Jesus named from his birthplace. It will thus be seen that the book is something more than a mere repetition of acknowledged facts. There is here a real contribution to learning. The author acknowledges his indebtedness to Zeller's "Apostelgeschichte nach ihren Inhalt und Ursprung" and to Baur's "Paulus." He has, however, done more than abstract from those authors. He has done good service in bringing together characteristics which, when pointed out, are striking. Especially is this the case when he parallels with the introduction of the name Paul in Acts xiii. 9, and the use of that name thereafter, the introduction of the name Peter in Luke v. 8 and vi. 14. Some points are unduly pressed, as in the supposed resemblance between the trial and death of Jesus and that of Stephen, and in the rush to see and hear Jesus and Paul. The author may not have meant to furnish an argument to those who claim as the motive of the Acts a desire to exalt Paul and his party as against Peter, but his section on the resemblance of the doings of Peter and Paul have that tendency. The book will doubtless prove useful, as in a small space it indicates the principal grounds for concluding that the Gospel according to St. Luke and the Acts of the Apostles are the work of the same author. GEORGE W. GILMORE.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

DER HEILIGE GEIST IN DER·HEILSVERKÜNDIGUNG DES PAULUS. Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung. Von JOHANNES G LOL. Halle: Niemeyer, 1888. 8vo, pp. viii., 402, 7 mk.

This book is one of those thorough discussions of a special point in biblical theology which are peculiar to German theological literature. Its aim is to give a complete statement of the Pauline conception of the Holy Spirit in its relation to the work of redemption through Christ. The author claims that, while the subject has been frequently treated, its importance as a part of Biblical theology has not been sufficiently recognized, and its treatment has been too largely determined by the anthropological standpoint. While a thorough understanding of the Pauline conception of the *σάρξ* is valuable, still it does not give us positive results as to the significance of the *πνεῦμα*. It leaves in the background the relation of the Spirit to the objective basis of salvation in Christ, and, therefore, exhibits but a section of what is implied by the Spirit in the Pauline theology. This fault the author endeavors to avoid by approaching the subject from the soteriological standpoint. St. Paul was not occupied with speculations as to the abstract nature of God, nor with psychological judgments as to the nature of man, but with the practical experience and knowledge of God in Christ as the power of human salvation. From this standpoint he spoke and wrote of the Holy Spirit, and from this standpoint we can best judge of the force of his expressions. Accepting as sources of knowledge, in opposition to the critical tendencies of the day, all the Pauline epistles, the author enters upon a careful exegetical study of all the passages relating to the Holy Spirit. He discusses first the reception of the Spirit as a fact of Christian experience, with its presuppositions in the general history of life, and in the history of redemption in particular, and with its means of communication through the Word and Baptism, on the one hand, and through faith on the other hand. Then, in the second part, he treats of the indwelling and operation of the Spirit in believers and in the Church. The whole discussion is carried on in a calm and scholarly manner, and while no especially new points are brought out, and while many modern views are rejected, the result is a clear and well-connected exposition of the great lines of St. Paul's thought.

The results to which the studies of the author lead, as to St. Paul's conception of the nature of the Spirit and of His relation to God and to Christ, are summed up at the end in a few pages of concise and clear statement. If we have expected an exact and direct definition of the Holy Spirit from St. Paul we shall be disappointed, for the Apostle views the Spirit from the plane of real life. For him the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of life, of the life of God, which is given to believers in Christ. And as life is experienced rather than defined, so for St. Paul the Spirit is known by experience and not by abstract terms. The author, therefore, has not attempted to formulate a Pauline definition of the Spirit, but to introduce his readers to the living intuitions which St. Paul, in his own Christian experience, has gained of the power and operation of the Spirit. In this line, however, certain positive results have been obtained which enable us to get some clear idea of what St. Paul's doctrine of the Spirit is. As in the Old Testament the Spirit of God is the divine breath of life, by which the creation is animated, so in the New Testament the *πνεῦμα* is the internally animating and vitalizing force, the breath of life, in which God communicates to the children of men in need of salvation His heavenly life-force. In this view the *πνεῦμα* stands in constant sharp contrast to the *σάρξ*, and in the inner personal life this contrast appears in the contrast between divine wisdom and human foolishness, childlike joy and slavish fear. The operations of the Spirit as facts of experience are therefore influences in opposition to the flesh, but at the same time are in their positive significance the work of the Messiah who was manifested in the flesh, and glorified through His death and resurrection. The office of the Spirit is to apply Christ's work of salvation to sinful man, and to bring His heavenly life to concrete form in believers. For St. Paul, therefore, the Spirit was neither the metaphysical substance of the Infinite, nor a celestial, supersensible Matter, nor the sum of the various supernatural operations of the divine power. The Spirit is a vital fact, having its own objective reality; it is the active power of life, by which God in Christ lives in the believer. And with this objective reality is connected the idea of personality. For the distinguishing mass of personal life is action accompanied by conscious volition, and, according to St. Paul, the Christian experiences the influences of the Spirit as personal influences exerted upon him. The life in the Spirit is for him a life of personal interchange between the faithful child of God and the Spirit of God, who offers grace, power, and life. But St. Paul does not in this way exalt the Holy Spirit as a personality into a position of independence by the side of God and Christ. Instead of this he teaches that the Christian experiences in the very influences which proceed from the Spirit the influences of the ascended Lord, and the self-witness of the Father. And yet the Spirit is not entirely lost in Christ and the Father, as merely a term for the sum of the effects which they produce. St. Paul makes a distinction between the Lord who was sent in the flesh and who was raised from the dead, and the Spirit poured out into the hearts of the faithful. In brief, his thought was that the love of God comes to its objective historical representation to the world in Christ crucified, and finds in the Spirit its living self-communication to the hearts of men. So that in the Spirit Christ's life is transferred into the lives of His followers. As St. Paul's purpose was not philosophical, but practical, he has nothing to say directly as to God's immanent essence and the internal relation of the Spirit to Father and Son in the Trinity. His confidence and joy lay in the conviction that God had reconciled the world to Himself in the Son, and in the Spirit enables us to share in that reconciliation, and that we as redeemed in Jesus Christ have free access to the Father in the Spirit. The Spirit which rules in Christians springs from God and leads to God. He brings Christ near to the heart, and raises the heart up to Christ. As the force of the divine life He sets the believer free from contamination with the transitory nature of the flesh and the world, and makes him a sharer in the eternal life of God. This expresses St. Paul's conviction of the positive significance and position of the Spirit of God in the work of salvation.

However we may differ from the author's critical position, and much as we may question some of his conclusions, his book is a solid and valuable contribution to Biblical Theology, and is well worthy of careful and studious attention.

H. Richard Harris.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

The Voices of the Psalms. By W. Pakenham Walsh, D.D., Bishop of Ossory, Ferns and Leighlin. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1890. 8vo, pp. xii., 333, $1.50.

It is a most difficult task for a specialist in any subject, to whom the technical expressions of his science are as familiar as our A B C, to forget these terms and names for a while and express his thoughts in words which can be readily understood by the average layman. Many a book which has been written with the best intentions and based on the broadest and fullest information has fallen into the ocean of books without a ripple. There is a power of imagination which is as necessary to an author in order to enable him to meet his readers on common ground, as is the range of knowledge which will warrant the writing of a book. Where either is lacking, we have a work predestined to failure. The scientist who has forgotten the language he once spoke—the language which his fellow-men still speak—cannot write to their edification, and his cumbrous attempt to unbend has removed him from the sphere where alone he is at home.

The volume now before us deals with the Book of Psalms. There is no attempt made to produce a commentary, and the writer has succeeded in excluding most of the technical expressions and crude material of the exegete. His motive has been rather to excite the interest of the reader, to whom the Psalms may have had small meaning, and to exhibit some of the various phases which they really present. Hence, for the exegete there is here little of importance, but for the ordinary reader things which may have been familiar enough in a disjointed way are brought together and made to throw light upon one another. The preacher, too, may find suggestions of method, which may be turned to good purpose.

The introductory chapter deals with the book as a whole, and gives some general information. It may be severely criticised in connection with its classification of the "parallelisms" of Hebrew poetry, for while the "constructive," the "responsive," and the "contrasted" parallelisms may suffice for the purposes of this book, they fail to set forth the great variety which is really to be found. The list of books appended for the use of students is quite behind the time with few exceptions. But as a whole the book ought to attain its object of being an introduction to the study of the Psalter.

The "voices" here considered are those of Praise, Prayer, Instruction, Creation, History, Immortality, of the Sanctuary, of Music, of the Shepherd, the Warrior and the Outlaw, of the Monarch, the Penitent and the Pilgrim, of Messiah—the King; of Messiah—the Prophet and Priest; of Redemption, of the Church, the Mission Field, the Spiritual Life, and of Benediction.

C. R. Gillett.

New York.

System of Christian Theology. By Henry B. Smith, D.D., LL.D. Edited by William S. Karr, D.D., Professor of Theology in Hartford Theologial Seminary. Fourth edition, revised. With an Introduction by Thomas S. Hastings, D.D., LL.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1890. 8vo, pp. xx., 641, $2.

The earlier editions of this well-known work of one who has been called the ablest of American theologians have been so long before the Christian public that there is no need at this late day of offering a review of the system or of doing more than give a plain statement of the respects in which the present edition is different from its predecessors. The fact that Dr. Hastings, President of Union Theological Seminary, has prepared an introduction is noted on the title-page. Dr. Karr's original preface remains. The text of the volume has been retained unaltered, and the only revision attempted has been in connection with the notes. These alterations are not numerous, and have been made by the Rev. Henry Goodwin Smith, son of the author. Mrs. Smith's index to the subjects in the text stands as heretofore, but a valuable textual index to the citations of Scripture has been added by Mr. Smith. The only other changes to be noted are in the facts that the paper is thinner, though still excellent, and the margin is cut a little closer. By a special arrangement with the family of Dr. Smith, the cost has been reduced from the former figures to the very moderate price of two dollars. The volume is thus placed within the easy reach of all who wish to possess a work which is monumental in the history of American Theology.

Charles R. Gillett.

New York.

Current Discussions in Theology. By the Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary. Volume VII. Boston and Chicago: Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society, 1890. 12mo, pp. xii., 410.

This series, here continued to the seventh volume, is already well and favorably known. Its purpose is to answer the question, "What has been done in the different fields of sacred learning during the past twelve months, and what are the latest results of such studies?" It is evident that within the compass of only a little over four hundred small pages it is not possible to review all of the books that have appeared. This is not a drawback, however, for it guarantees that we have presented to us only the best books. The authors do not pretend to display all of the contents of the books which they notice, but only the portions which seem to be new or especially valuable.

The present volume is intended to cover the most important works of 1889, but some from 1888 and 1890 are also included. In this way one can get a view of the whole field of theology as it is ordinarily divided into departments in Theological Encyclopædia. There is a drawback to the usefulness of this series of volumes in the fact that they appear at such long intervals. Even the quarterlies suffer from the infrequency of their appearance. But these ' Current Discussions" have an advantage over the review department of a quarterly or even a monthly in that all the works in a single department come under the view of a single professor, who is thus enabled to give a unity to the treatment and section which is impossible to the editor, with his corps of reviewers. It is important not only to know what the character of a single book is, but also what its bearing upon the literature of the whole subject may be.

It is to be hoped that the scope of the work may be widened as the authors propose, so as to include the departments of "Comparative Religion, the Relation of Religion and Science, Christian Art, Inter-Denominational History, and Christian Ethics." As at present arranged, we find treated the four main divisions of theological science, with such subdivisions as are required to include those books or magazine and review articles of importance which have appeared within the time covered by the "Discussions."

A fairly full index concludes the volume, making its contents available, while a very full table of contents gives a clear view of the arrangement of the material.

Within the limits of a notice such as this it is impossible to go into the minutiæ of the volume, and one must be content to give merely a brief notion of its character. C. R. GILLETT.

NEW YORK.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Acta apostolorum apocrypha. Post Const. Tischendorf denuo edd. Ricardus A. Lipsius et Maximilianus Bonnet. Pars I. Acta Petri, Acta Pauli, acta Petri et Pauli, acta Pauli et Theclæ, acta Thaddei, ed. R. A. L. Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1891 (1890.) Pp. cxi., 320, 8vo, 12 mk.

Acta martyrum et sanctorum. Syriace edidit Bedjan. Tomus I. Parisiis, 1890. Pp. x., 550, 8vo, 20 fr.

Adams, J. Coleman, D.D. Christian Types of Heroism. Boston: Univ. Publ. House, 1890. Pp. iv., 208, 16mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Alexander, J. E., D.D. Brief History of the Synod of Tennessee from 1817 to 1877. Knoxville, Tenn.: Thompson, 1890. Pp. vii., 162, 8vo, cloth, 75 cts.

Allies, T. W. Peter's Rock in Mohammed's Flood. (The Formation of Christendom series.) New York: Cath. Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. 530, 8vo, $2.80.

Andrews, E. Benjamin, D.D., LL.D. History, Prophecy, and Gospel. Expository Sermons on the International Sunday-School Lessons for 1891. Boston: Silver Burdett, 1890. Pp. viii., 461, 8vo.

Appel, Heinrich. Die Lehre der Scholastiker von der Synteresis. Preisschrift. Rostock: Volckmann, 1891 (1890.) Pp. vii., 60, 8vo, 2 mk.

Barbier de Montault, X., Mgr. Traité d'iconographie chrétienne 2 vols. Paris: Vivès, 1890. Pp. 444, 517, 8vo.

Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire, J. La Philosophie dans ses rapports avec les sciences et la religion. Paris: Alcan, 1890. Pp. 284, 8vo, 5 fr.

Bauerfeind, G. Fr. Chr. Das altkirchliche Perikopensystem der abendländischen Kirche, auf Grundlage und unter dem Lichte des apostolischen Glaubensbe-Kenntnisses behandelt. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1890. Pp. xxiv., 456, 8vo, 5 mk.

Becker, Jos. Blas. Dr. Die Weissagungen als Kriterien der Offenbarung. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1890. Pp. viii., 224, 8vo, 3 mk.

Beet, J. Agar. A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and to Philemon. London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. 410, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Bell, A. J. Why Does Man Exist? The Continuation and Conclusion of "Whence Comes Man?" London: Isbister, 1890. Pp. 428, 8vo, 12s.

Blore, G. F. The Weighty Charges and other Ordination Addresses. London: Longmans, 1890. Pp. 130, 8vo, 3s 6d.

Blümel, E. Luther's Lebensende. Widerlegung der durch den römischen Priester Majunke hervorgesuchten und verarbeiteten Lügenberichte. Barmen: Klein, 1890. Pp. 80, 12mo, 75 pf.

Blunt, J. J., Rev. Undesigned Coincidences in the Writings of both the Old and New Testaments; introduction by T. Sanderson, D.D. New York: Ketcham, 1890. Pp. x., 361, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Bond, J. The Gospel according to St. Luke: Being the Greek Text as revised by Drs. Westcott and Hort, with Introduction and Notes. London: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. 164, 18mo, 2s. 6d.

Bornemann, W. Prof. Unterricht im Christentum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1891 (1890.) Pp. xvi., 301, 8vo, 4.40 mk.

Bouquillon, T. I. Theologia moralis fundamentalis. Paris: 1890. 8vo, 8 fr.

Bousset, Wilh. Die Evangeliencitate Justins des Märtyrers in ihrem Wert für die Evangelien Kritik, von neuem untersucht. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1891 (1890.) Pp. iii., 128, 8vo, 2.80 mk.

Braithwaite, R. The True Grounds of Religious Faith: An essay on Dr. Martineau's recent book, "The Seat of Authority in Religion." London: Kegan Paul, 1890. Pp. 154, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Brooks, Phillips, D.D. A Christmas Sermon. New York: Dutton, 1890. Pp. 32, 16mo, 25 cts.

Burney, S. G., D.D. Studies in Psychology. Nashville, Tenn.: Cumb. Presb. Pub. House, 1890. Pp. xvi., 535, 12mo, 75 cts.

Buxton, H. J. Wilmot. Pictures from the Acts of the Apostles. Illustrated by W. Hughes, also Pictures from the Gospels. Illustrated by W. Hughes. Both, London: Mowbray, 1890. 8vo, each 2s. Also, God's Heroes: a series of plain sermons. London: Skeffington, 1890. Pp. x., 234, 8vo, 5s.

Carlyle, Gavin, Rev. Moses and the Prophets. London: Stock, 1890. Pp. xvi., 104, 12mo.

Clark, F. E., Rev., D.D. Ways and Means. For the Y. P. S. C. E. A book of suggestions for the prayer-meeting, the committees, and all lines of Christian work adopted by Christian Endeavor Societies. Boston: Lothrop, 1890. Pp. 200, 12mo.

Clark, W. Savonarola, his Life and Times. Chicago: McClurg, 1890. Pp. ii., 352, 12mo. cloth, $1.50.

Clifford, W. Sermon Preached at the Funeral of His Eminence, John H. Newman. London: Kegan Paul, 1890. 8vo, 1s.

Conrad, K. Martin Butzer, ein Reformator Strassburgs. (Schriften des protestantischen liberalen Vereins in Elsass-Lothringen, Band 35.) Strassburg: Treuttel, 1890. Pp. 50, 12mo, 25 pf.

Courtier, H. Biblical Atlas and Scriptural Gazetteer. Rev. and enl. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 100, 4to, cloth, $2.00.

Cox, S. The Book of Ecclesiastes, with a New Translation. (Expositor's Bible.) London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. 338, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Crake, A. D., Rev. Stories of the Old Saints and the Anglo-Saxon Church. London: Mowbray, 1890. Pp. viii., 136, 8vo, 2s.

Cuyler, Theodore L., Rev., D.D. How To Be a Pastor. New York: Baker & Taylor, 1890. Pp. iii., 151, 16mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Dabney, Robert L., Rev., D.D. Discussions. Edited by C. R. Vaughan. In 4 vols. Vol. I. Theological and Evangelical. Richmond, Va. Presb. Com. of Pub., 1890. Pp. x., 728, 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Delitzsch, Franz. See Volck.

Döllinger, J. J. I. v. Kleinere Schriften, gedruckte und ungedruckte. Gesammelt und herausgegeben von F. H. Reusch. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1890. Pp. viii., 608, 8vo, 11.50 mk.

Dörholt, Bernh., Dr. Die Lehre von der genugthuung Christi, theologisch dargestellt und erörtert. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1891 (1890.) Pp. xi., 517, 8vo, 6 mk.

Donderus, A. Institutiones biblicæ, e probatis auctoribus excerptæ et tironum usui accommodatæ. Genua, 1890. Pp. 509, 8vo, 5.50 mk.

Dreves, Guida Maria, S. J. Analecta hymnica medii ævi. IX. sequentiæ ineditæ. Liturgische Prosen des Mittelalters aus Handschriften und Wiegendrucken. 2. Folge. Leipzig : Reisland, 1890. Pp. 296, 8vo, 8.50 mk.

Dryander, Ernst, Prof. Das Evangelium Marci, in Predigten und Homilien ausgelegt. 1. Hälfte. (Die vier Evangelien, in Predigten und Homilien Ausgelegt . . . herausgegeben von Dr. Rud. Kögel. 2. Abtheilung, 1. Hälfte.) Bremen : Müller, 1891 (1890.) Pp. x., 359, 8vo, 6 mk. (I. 1, and II. 1, 13.50 mk.)

Dubois, Frdr. Das Buch der Religionen. Stuttgart : Brennwald, 1890. Pp. xvi., 777, 8vo, 10 mk.

Dunckley, C., Rev. Official Report of the Church Congress held at Hull, 1890. London : Bemrose, 1890. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Dutt, R. Chunder. A History of Civilization in Ancient India, based on Sanscrit Literature. London : Trübner, 1890. 3 vols. Vol. III. Pp. 514, 8vo, 8s.

Edersheim, A. Tohu-va-Bohu. (Without Form and Void) : A collection of fragmentary thoughts and criticisms. Edited, with a memoir, by Ella Edersheim. With a portrait. London : Longmans, 1890. Pp. 182, 8vo, 6s.

Edersheim, E W. The Rites and Worships of the Jews. New York and Chicago : Revell, 1891. Pp. 176, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Edwards, Robert A., Rev. From Joppa to Mount Hermon : A series of narrative discourses on the Holy Land, delivered in the church of St. Matthias, Philadelphia, during the autumn and winter of 1889-1890. Philadelphia : Porter & Coates, 1890. Pp. ii., 256, 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Ellis, James, Rev. Hugh Latimer. London : Nisbet, 1890. Pp. 114, 12mo, 1s. Charles Kingsley. London : Nisbet, 1890. Pp. 104, 12mo, 1s. (Both in Men with a Mission series.)

Eusebius. Church History, Translated with Prolegomena and Notes by Rev. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, Ph D. Life of Constantine, the oration of Constantine to the Assembly of the Saints, and the oration of Eusebius in praise of Constantine. A revised translation, with prolegomena and notes, by Ernest Cushing Richardson, Ph.D. (Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, second series. Vol I.) New York : Christian Lit. Co., 1890. Pp. x., 632, 8vo, $3.00.

Evans, John, Rev. Jacob Herbert. A Study in Theology. London : Hodder, 1890. Pp. 498, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Evarts, W. W., D.D. The Christian Apostolate : Its principles, methods and promise in evangelism, missions, and in social progress. New York and Chicago : Revel, 1891. Pp. 534, 8vo, cloth, $1.50.

Fabre, d'Envieu, J. Le Livre du prophète Daniel traduit d'après le texte hébreu, araméen et grec avec une introduction critique ou défense nouvelle du livre et un commentaire littéral, exégètique et apologétique. Tome 2. Traduction et commentaire. Partie I. Chapîtres I., I. bis, II.-V., V. bis, VI.-VII. Paris : Thorin, 1890. Pp. xvi., 788, 8vo, 15 fr.

Fouard, Constant, Abbé. The Christ, the Son of God : A life of Jesus Christ ; translated from the 5th edition by G. F. X. Griffith ; with introduction by Cardinal Manning. New York : Longmans, 1890. 2 vols., 8vo, cloth, $4.00.

Fox, A. The Patriarchs and Leaders of Israel. For the Young. London : Simpkin, 1890. Pp. 230, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Friedlaender, M. H , Rabbi, Dr. Die Arbeit nach der Bibel, dem Talmud, und den Aussprüchen der Weisen in Israel. Brünn : Epstein, 1890. Pp. iii., 53, 8vo, 1 mk.

Gasquet, Francis Ardan, and Bishop Edmund. Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer : an examination into its origin and early history. With an appendix of unpublished documents. London : Hodges, 1890. Pp. 464, 8vo, 12s.

Geyer, P. Kritische Bemerkungen zu S. Silviæ Aquitanæ peregrinatio ad loca sancta. Program. Augsburg, 1890. Pp. 60, 8vo, 1. 20 mk.

Geesink, W. De beteekenis van het berstuk der oorspronkelijke gerechtigheid voor de godgeberde zedekunde. Rede. Amsterdam : Wormser, 1890. Pp. 39, 8vo, 60 fl.

Giddings, Edward, Rev. American Christian Rulers ; or, Religion and Men of the Government. Comprising sketches in American history of men of Christian faith and experience, who have had connection with the national and state government and the judicial department, embracing colonial, revolutionary, and later periods ; alphabetically arranged, with chronological index of early state governors. Compiled by——. New York : Broomfield, 1890. Pp. xix., 590, 8vo, $3.00.

Glazebrook, M. G. Lessons from the Old Testament. (Junior Course) : The Creation to Nehemiah. London : Perceval, 1890. Pp. 370, 12mo, 2s. 6d.

Goldstein, M. A. Gebet und Glaube. Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung und Erläuterung des Gottesdienstes und dessen Gebräuche. Nach den bewährtesten alten und neuen Qellen auf dem Gebiete der jüdischen Literatur. Ausserdem wird hier die in den gebetostücken enthaltene Religionslehre neu bearbeitet und zum ersten Male ver öffentlicht, nebst einem Anhang. Budapest, 1890. Pp. vi., 125, 8vo, 2 mk.

Goss, W. H. Hebrew Captives of the Kings of Assyria. London : Simpkin, 1890. Pp. 330, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Gough, Edward. The Bible True from the Beginning. Vol. IV. London : Kegan Paul, 1890. 8vo, 16s.

Gregg, D., Rev., D.D., and **Mudge,** L. W., Rev., D.D. From Solomon to the Captivity : The Story of two Hebrew Kingdoms. New York : Am. Tr. Soc., 1890. Pp. ii , 292, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Grimley, H. N. The Prayer of Humanity : Sermons on the Lord's Prayer. London : Kegan Paul, 1890. Pp. 198, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Gruppe, Otto. Die rhapsodische Theogonie und ihre Bedeutung innerhalb der orphischen Litteratur. (Besonderer Abdruck aus dem 7 tem Supplementbande der Jahrbücher für classische Philologie. Pp. 690–747.) Leipzig : Teubner, 1890. 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Hall, J. Rev., **Swing.** D., Rev., and others. From Beginning to End : Comments on the Life of Christ ; written by ten of the most prominent clergymen of America ; illustrated by photogravure after paintings by Gérôme, Doré, Da Vinci, Scheffer, Hunt, etc. New York : F. A. Stokes, 1890. Fo. cloth, $7.50.

Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften in encyklopädischer Darstellung mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Entwicklungsgeschichte der einzelnen Disziplinen, in Verbindung mit Cremer, Grau, Harnack, etc., herausgegeben von O. Zöckler. Supplement-Bant, II. Abtheilung. B. Der römische Katolizismus (Evangelische Polemik) von Vet. Schultze. C. Grundzüge der allgemeinen Religionswissenschaft auf Geschichtlicher Grundlage von Br. Lindner. München : Beck, 1890. Pp. xii., 197–443, 8vo, 3.50 mk.

Hardmann, J. W. Our Prayer-Book in History, Literature, and Church Lore. With some reminiscences of parson, clerk, and sexton in the olden times. London : Skeffington, 1890. Pp. ii., 168, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Hardy, E. Der Buddhismus nach älteren Pâli-Werken. München, 18 0. Pp. 176, 8vo, 85 cts.

Hase, Karl von. Kirchengeschichte auf der Grundlage akademischer Vorlesungen. 2. Theil, mittlere Kirchengeschichte. Leipzig : Breitkopf, 1890. Pp. vi., 578, 8vo, 12 mk.

Hauffe, Gust. Herder in seinen Ideen zur Philosophie und geschichte der Menschheit. Borna : Jahnke, 1890. Pp. 127, 8vo, 1.50 mk. Die Wiedergeburt des Menschen. Abhandlung über die sieben letzten Paragraphen von Lessing's Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts. Borna : Jahnke, 1890. Pp 300, 8vo, 3 mk.

Herring, Richard Francis. The Two Mysteries : Life and Death. A series of eight addresses. London : Skeffington, 1890. Pp. 60, 8vo, 2s.

Holtzmann, Osc., Prof. Das Christusbild der Geschichte und das Christusbild der Dogmatik. Ein Vortrag. Darmstadt : Waitz, 1890. Pp. 32, 8vo, 80 pf.

Huntington, W. R , D.D. The Causes of the Soul : A Book of Sermons. New York : Dutton, 1890. Pp. 390, 12mo, cloth, $1.75.

Jackson, A. G., Rev. The Missioner's Book of Sermons. Notes and Illustrations. Hull : Brown, 1890. Pp. 374, 8vo, 6s.

Jacob, Edgar. The Divine Society ; or, the Church's Care of Large Populations : Six lectures on pastoral theology, delivered in the Divinity School, Cambridge, May term, 1890. London : S. P. C. K., 1890. Pp. 184, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Jungnitz, J. Sebastian von Rostock, Bischof von Breslau. Mit dem Portrait Rostocks. Breslau : Aderholz, 1891. Pp. vii., 232, 8vo, 3 mk.

Kerr, Robert Pollock, Rev., D.D. The Voice of God in History. Richmond, Va. Presb. Com. of Pub., 1890. Pp. ii., 283, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Kerry, B., Dr. System einer Theorie der Grenzgebiete. Ein Beitrag zur Erkenntnisstheorie. I. Theil, herausgegeben von Dr. Gust. Kohn. Wien : Deuticke, 1890. Pp. xv., 198, 8vo, 5 mk.

Kingsley, Charles. Discipline, and other Sermons. London : Macmillan, 1890. Pp. 310, 8vo, 3s. 6d. The Gospel of the Pentateuch, a set of parish sermons, and David, five sermons. London : Macmillan, 1890. Pp. 316, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Also, The Good News of God : Sermons. New York : Macmillan, 1890. Pp. 321, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Klein, Félix, Abbé. Le Cardinal Lavigerie et ses œuvres d'Afrique. Paris : Levé, 1890. Pp. lv., 423, 18mo, 3.50 fr.

Kurtz, J. H. Church History: Authorized translation from the latest revised editions, by Rev. J. Macpherson. 3 vols. Vol. II. and III. New York: Funk & W., 1890. Pp. xiv., 544, 8vo, cloth, each, $2.00.

Langdon, S. The Happy Valley: Our New Mission Field in Uva, Ceylon. London: Kelly, 1890. Pp. 136, 8vo, 2s.

Lange, K. Der Papstesel. Ein Beitrag zur Kultur-und Kunstgeschichte des Reformationszeitalters. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1891 (1890.) Pp. viii., 118, 8vo, 4 mk.

Lebel, H. La place que Jésus revendique dans le royaume des cieux, d'après les synoptiques. Thèse. Montauban: Granié, 1890. Pp. 63, 8vo.

Lefèvre, A. L'Evolution religieuse; huitième conférence transformiste. Paris: Hemmyer, 1890. Pp. 27, 8vo.

Liddell, Mrs. Edward. The Golden Censer: Being a selection from the prayers of the saints, A.D. 69–1890. London: Longmans, 1890. Pp. 146, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Lightfoot, J. B., D.D. Sermons. (Contemporary Pulpit Library, No. 5.) New York: Whittaker, 1890. Pp. 186, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Lightfoot, J. B., D.D., ed. The Apostolic Fathers. Part I. St. Clement of Rome; a revised text, with introduction, notes, dissertations, and translations. New York: Macmillan, 1890. 2 vols. Pp. 1030, 8vo, cloth, $10.00.

Lipp, A. Die Hymnen des Cistercienser-Breviers, übersetzt und erklärt. Wien: Kirsch, 1890. Pp. ix., 370, 8vo, 5 mk.

Lipsius, Richard Adelbert. Die apocryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden. Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Literaturgeschichte Ergänzunsheft. Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1890. Pp. viii., 266, 8vo, 8 mk.

Loueneau, Michel. De la bénédiction à travers les temps. Elévations sur les brenfaits de Dieu. Paris: Poussielque, 1890. 16mo, 3.50 fr.

Loughlin, J. F., D.D. Sermons and Lectures. Philadelphia: Kilner, 1890. Pp. iii., 212, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Luckock, H. M. The Intermediate State Between Death and Judgment: Being a sequel to "After Death." London: Longmans, 1890. Pp. 276, 8vo, 6s.

Macaroni, Palmieri, Fr. Lezioni teologali esegetiche della lettera dell' l'apostolo Paolo ai Romani, Firenze, 1890. Pp. 381, 8vo, 4 mk.

McCosh, Jas., Rev., D.D. The Prevailing Types of Philosophy. New York: Scribners, 1890. 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

MacDonald, James, Rev. Light in Africa. London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. viii., 264, 8vo, 6s.

McNeill, J., Rev. Sermons Preached in the Regent Square Pulpit, London. Vol. II. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 416, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Manen, W. C. van. Paulus. I. De handelingen der Apostolen. Leiden: Brill, 1890. Pp. ii., 207, 8vo, 2.25 fl.

Marillier, Léon. La Liberté de conscience. Rapport présenté au nom du jury du concours sur la liberté de conscience. Paris: Colin, 1890. 12mo, 3 fr.

Maurice, F. Denison. The Gospel of St. John: A series of discourses. New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. xvi., 501, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Mir y Noguera, J. La creación según que se contiene en el primer capitulo del Genesis. Madrid, 1890. Pp. xviii., 1075, 4to, 12.80 mk.

Newman, J. H. The Founder of Modern Anglicanism and a Cardinal of the Roman Church. With a Portrait. London: Kegan Paul, 1890. Pp. 112, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Ojea y Marquez, S. El reinado de Jesu Christo. Toledo, 1890. Pp. 396, 4to, 8 mk.

Oldcastle, J. Cardinal Newman: A Monograph. New York: Cath. Pub. Soc., 1890. Pp. 76, 8vo, cloth, 60 cts.

Oliphant, Mrs. Royal Edinborough. Her Saints, Kings, Prophets, and Poets. With illustrations by George Reid, R. S. A. New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. xiii., 520, 12mo, $3.00.

Olivier, J. Anselme de Cantorbéry d'après ses meditations. Thèse. Toulouse: Chauvin, 1890. Pp. 46.

Ormiston, J. Wine and Oil from Immanuel's Land: Being a series of Palestine narratives illustrative of the gospel of the grace of God suggested by the auther's travels in the Holy Land. With introduction by the Bishop of Liverpool. London: Simpkin, 1890. Pp. 240, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Padmanji, Baba. Once Hindoo, now Christian. The early life of. An Autobiography. Edited by J. Murray Mitchell. London: Nisbet, 1890. Pp. 166, 12mo, 2s.

Paret, Frdr., Dr. Priscillianus, ein Reformator des 4. Jahrhunderts. Eine Kirchengeschichtliche Studie, zugleich ein Kommentar zu den erhaltenen Schriften Priscillians. Würzburg: Stuber, 1891 (1890.) Pp. viii., 302, 8vo, 6 mk.

Perowne, T. T. Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. With Notes and Introduction. (Cambridge Bible for Schools.) Cambridge Warehouse, 1890. Pp. 190, 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Phelps, Austin, D.D. My Note-book: Fragmentary studies in theology and subjects adjacent thereto. New York: Scribners, 1891 (1890.) Pp. viii., 324, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Pompery, Edouard de. La Morale naturelle et la religion de l'humanité. Paris: Reinwald, 1890, 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Pressensé, Edmond de. Alexandre Vinet d'après sa correspondance inédite avec Henri Lutteroth. Paris: Fischbacker, 1890, 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Price, Jacob Embury. Epworth League Workers. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1890. Pp. 217, 12mo, 75 cts.

Rapin, E. Les livres de l'ancien et du nouveau testament. Introduction a la lecture de la Bible. Lausanne: Payot, 1890. Pp. 331, 12mo, 2.50 fr.

Reed, Elizabeth A. Hindu Literature; or, the Ancient Books of India. Chicago: Griggs & Co., 1890. Pp. 410, 12mo, cloth, $2.00.

Reed, H. V., Mrs. The Bible Triumphant: Twelve dozen sceptical arguments refuted. A reply to a work entitled, "One Hundred and Forty-Four Self-Contradictions of the Bible." With a preface by H. L. Hastings. London: Marshall, 1890. Pp. vi., 160, 8vo, 1s.

Roberts, D. A Letter from Heaven, and other Sermons. London: Stock, 1890. 8vo, 5s.

Röhricht, Rhold. Bibliotheca geographica Palæstina. Chronologisches Verzeichniss der auf die Geographie des heiligen Landes bezüglichen Literatur von 333 bis 1878 und Versuch einer Cartographie. Mit Unterstützung der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin. Berlin: Reuther, 1890. Pp. xx., 744, 8vo, 24 mk.

Saftien, K. Die Verhandlungen Kaiser Ferdinand I. mit Papst Pius IV. über den Laienkelch und die Einführung desselben in Oesterreich. Mit archivalischen Beilagen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1890. Pp. 85, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Scaduto, Fr. Diritto ecclesiastico vigente in Italia. Vol. II. Napoli, 1890. Pp. 816, 8vo, 12 mk.

Schaller, L. W. Das Leiden des Gerechten. Zwei Vorträge über das Buch Hiob. Basel: Geering, 1890. Pp. 40, 8vo, 50 pf.

Schmid, Al. Erkenntnisslehre. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1890. 2. Bände. Pp. viii., 498; v., 428, 8vo, 9 mk.

Schmidt, A. Kirchenrechtliche Quellen des Grossherzothums Hessen. Eine Quellensammlung zur Stellung von Staat und Kirche und zum kirchlichen Verfassungsrecht. Giessen: Ricker, 1890. Pp. viii., 239, 8vo, 5 mk.

Schnedermann, G. Ueber den jüdischen Hintergrund im Neuen Testament. Antrittsvorlesung. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1890. Pp. 21, 8vo, 40 pf.

Schrempf, Chr., Prof. Die christliche Weltanschauung und Kant's sittlicher Glaube. Eine religiöse Untersuchung. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1891 (1890.) Pp. xiv., 54, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Schultz, Herm. Die evangelische Theologie in ihrem Verhältnisse zu Wissenschaft und Frömmigkeit. Vortrag, gehalten im wissenschaftlichen Predigerverein zu Hannover, 1. Oct., 1890. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1890. Pp. 2[illegible], 8vo, 60 pf.

Secker, W., Rev. The Nonsuch Professor. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 367, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Sepp, Chr. Uit het predikantenleven van vroegere tijden. Aanteekeningen. Leiden: Brill, 1890. Pp. viii., 160, 8vo, 2 fl.

Simcox, W. H. The Writers of the New Testament: Their Style and Characteristics; the second part of the Language of the New Testament. (Theological Educator series.) London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. 198, 12mo, 2s. 6d.

Smith, G. A. The Book of Isaiah. 2 vols. Vol. II: Isaiah xl.-lxvi. With a sketch of the history of Israel from Isaiah to the exile. (Expositor's Bible.) London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. 494, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Socrates and Sozomen, Translated into English with Prolegomena and Explanatory Notes, by Rev. A. C. Zenos, D.D., and Rev. C. D. Hartrauft, D.D., of Hartford Theological Seminary. (Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, second series, Vol. II.) New York: Chr. Lit. Co., 1890. Pp. 455, 8vo, $3.00.

Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. The First Thirty Years; with biographical sketch by J. A. Broaddus, D.D. Baltimore: Wharton, Barrow & Co., 1890. 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Spalding, J. L., Rt. Rev. (R. C. Bp. of Peoria, Ill.). Education and the Higher Life. Chicago: McClurg, 1890. Pp. iii., 210, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Spitta, Frdr. Zur Reform des evangelischen Kultus. Briefe und Abhandlungen, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1891 (1890.) Pp. viii., 140, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Spurgeon, C. H. Twelve Christmas Sermons. Also, Twelve New Year's Sermons. Delivered at the Metropolitan Tabernacle. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. 2 vols. Pp. 696, 8vo, each, 50 cts.

Stanley, A. P. Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age. London: Griffith & F., 1890. Pp. 260, 8vo, 1s.

Stein, Ludw., Prof., Dr. Leibnitz und Spinoza. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der leibnizischen Philosophie. Mit 19 Ineditis aus dem Nachlass von Leibniz. Berlin: Reimer, 1890. Pp. xvi., 362, 8vo, 8 mk.

Stockwell, T. H., Editor. Our Dead: Where are They? A symposium by well-known writers, concerning the present condition of departed believers. London: Stock, 1890. Pp. 168, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Strabonis, Walafridi. Liber de exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum. Textum recensuit, adnotationibus historicis et exegeticis illustravit, introductionem et indicem addidit. Prof. Dr. Aloisius Knoepfler. München: Stahl, 1890. Pp. xviii., 114, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Strauss und Torney, Victor von, Dr. Entstehung und Geschichte des altägyptischen Götterglaubens. (Der Altägyptische Götterglaube. 2te Theil.) Heidelberg: Winter, 1891. Pp. viii., 404, 8vo, 10 mk.

Szalatnay, J. G. A. Bilder aus der Toleranz-Zeit im Königreiche Böhmen. Barmen: Klein, 1890. Pp. iv., 99, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Taylor, William M., D.D., LL.D. The Miracles of Our Saviour, Expounded and Illustrated. New York: Armstrong, 1890. Pp. vi., 449, 8vo, $1.75.

Thomas, J. L. Oxford to Palestine: Being Notes of a Tour made in the Autumn of 1889. London: Leadenhall Press, 1890. Pp. 100, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Thurnhuber, M. Die vorzüglichsten Glaubenslehren in den Schriften desheiligen Bischofes und Martyrers Cyprianus von Carthago. 1. Hälfte. Program. Augsburg, 1890. Pp. 66, 8vo.

Tschackert, P. Urkundenbuch zur Reformationsgeschichte des Herzogthums Preussen. 1. Band: Einleitung; 2. Band: Urkunden. 1. Theil, 1523-1541. (Publicationen aus den Königlichen preussischen Staats-archiven, Bände 43 und 44.) Leipzig: Hirzel, 1890. Pp. xii., 389 und viii., 436, 8vo, 9. mk und 10. mk.

Tuckley, H., Rev. Forward, March; Through Battle to Victory: Talks to young people on life and success. Cincinnati, O.: Cranston & Stowe, 1890. Pp. iii., 239, 16mo, cloth, $1.00.

Vaughan, C. J. The Church of the First Days: Lectures on the Acts of the Apostles. London: Macmillan, new ed., 1890. Pp. 620, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Vigoroux, F. Le Nouveau Testament et les découvertes archéologiques modernes. Paris: Berche, 1890. 12mo, 4 fr.

Volck, W. Theologische Briefe der Professoren Delitzsch und von Hofmann. Leipzig: 1890. Pp. 246, 8vo, $1.85.

Waldberg, Sam., Rabbi. Dibre Schmuel. Beiträge zur Methodologie des Talmud. Als Anhang: Kritische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der talmud-rabinischen Literatur, in alphabetischer Ordnung dargestellt, und mit Indices versehen. (In hebr. Sprache.) Krakau (Wien: Lippe), 1889. Pp. 378, 8vo, 6 mk.

Watt, D. G., **Leale,** T. H., and **Barlow,** G. The Preachers' Homiletic Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel. London: Dickinson, 1890. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Weill, A. Les Cinq livres (mosaïstes) de Moïse. Traduits textuellement sur l'hébreu, avec commentaires et etymologies (2 e livre: l'exode.) Paris: Sauvaitre, 1890. 8vo, 5 fr.

Wernigk, Ferd-Ghard. Frz., Dr. Leibnitz' Lehre von der Freiheit des menschlichen Willens. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Kritik der philosophischen Systeme. Würzburg: Bucher, 1890. Pp. iii., 59, 8vo, 60 pf.

Wetstein, O., Dr. Die religiöse Lyrik der Deutschen im 19. Jahrhunderte. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte der Neuzeit. Neustrelitz: Barnewitz, 1891. Pp. iv., 336, 8vo, 4 mk.

Wharton, H. M., Rev., D.D. Pulpit, Pew, and Platform. Baltimore: Wharton, Barrow & Co., 1890. 12mo, cloth, $1.50 Also, Wharton's Gospel Talks. Baltimore: Wharton, Barrow & Co., 1890. 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Whitehead, J. H. The Gospel of Jesus Christ according to St. Matthew. Edited, with Notes and Explanations. London: Nisbet, 1890. Pp. 94, 12mo, 1s.

Wiedemann, Thdr. Die religiöse Bewegung in Oberösterreich und Salzburg beim Beginne des 19. Jahrhunderts. Innsbruck: Wagner, 1890. Pp. xii., 405, 8vo, 6.40 mk.

Wise, C. Puritanism in Power: An Argument in Three Books. London: Kegan Paul, 1890. Pp. 517, 8vo, 14s.

Wood, J. T. Modern Discoveries on the Site of Ancient Ephesus. (By-paths of Bible Knowledge, Vol. XIV.). New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 128, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Worcester, John. The Spiritual Interpretation of the Scripture. Lectures on Genesis and Exodus. Boston: Mass. New Church Union, 1890. Pp. 183, 12mo, 75 cts.

NOTES ON THE MAGAZINES.

THE literary magazines can, of course, give comparatively small space to religious literature, but few numbers fail to contain something that no one can afford to miss. The *Atlantic*, for example, in its January and February numbers has papers by Professor Josiah Royce on "Two Philosophers of the Paradoxical," viz., Hegel and Schopenhauer. In the February number, "The New England Meeting-House," by Alice Morse Earle, should also be read.—In the January *Forum* no one will overlook President Timothy Dwight's "Formative Influences," an autobiographical sketch, or W. S. Lilly's "The Shibboleth of Liberty."—The *North American Review* has an essay of more than usual interest on "Vital Statistics of the Jews," by Dr. John S. Billings.—Among the choice miscellany of *Littell's Living Age*, one notes especially two papers in the number for January 10th: "Constantinople Revisited," from the *Nineteenth Century*, and "The Druses of the Holy Land," from *Blackwood's Magazine.*—The *Contemporary Review* for January contains these valuable papers, besides that of Canon MacColl elsewhere reprinted: "The Early Life of Cardinal Newman," by Edwin A. Abbott, DD.; "Morality by Act of Parliament," by R. Anderson, LL.D.; "Public Landed Endowments of the Church," by the Rev. H. W. Clarke, and "The Certainties of Christianity," by Professor J. Agar Beet.—In the *Nineteenth Century* the Duke of Argyll leads off with "Professor Huxley on the Warpath," and the only other article that can be called religious is "The Jew as a Workman," by David F. Schloss.

In glancing over the more distinctively religious periodicals, one is at a loss, not what to mention, but where to stop short of giving complete tables of contents. We mention, therefore, only the more important articles. The discussion by Professor G. T. Ladd of "The Biblical and the Philosophical Conception of God," begun in the January *Old Testament Student*, is a weighty one; and in the same number, "The Origin of the Hebrew Sabbath," by Rev. J. T. Nichols, and the biographical sketch of Professor Charles A. Briggs, D.D., by Rev. James M. Ludlow, D.D., should by no means be neglected.—In the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, while everything is good, Principal D. W. Simon's discussion of "The Doctrine of the *Testimonium Spiritus Sancti*," and Professor Frank Hugh Foster's "The Benevolence Theory of the Atonement," are especially scholarly and strong.—Readers of the *Methodist Review* will probably turn at once to the "Symposium" on "The Temperance Movement," as the most timely of the January number's articles, but they would perhaps do better to stop and study with Professor George R. Crooks "The Gospel of John," or with Rev. John A. Roche, D.D., consider "The Holy Spirit as a Factor in Our Spiritual Life."—The January *Andover Review* contains two very good papers: "Dr. Martineau's Criticism of the Gospels," by Professor Hincks, and "The Question of Disestablishment in Scotland from the American Point of View," by A. Taylor Innes, Advocate.—A practical study is contributed to the *Lutheran Review* for January, by Professor L. A. Gotwald, on "Unutilized Forces in Our Churches," and in a similar vein Professor W. H. Wynn writes on "Creed of Deeds; or, Didactics of Spiritual Truth." A discussion of "The 'Historic Episcopate' in the Lutheran Church," by Rev. Frank Manhart, is of special interest just now.—The *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* presents a solid feast in its January number, and the difficulty is to particularize. We must, in fact, name all the main articles, which are as follows: "Recent Dogmatic Thought in Austria-Hungary," by Edouard Böhl; "The Theological School, a Practical Institution," by David D. Demarest; "The Logos of Philo and St. John," by Paton J. Gloag; "The Sumerian Question," by J. F. McCurdy; "Laurentius Valla," by Philip Schaff; "Christianity and its Counterfeits," by William Alexander; "The Chronology of the Divided Kingdom," by John D. Davis.

THE

MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 3. MARCH, 1891. No. 6.

For THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

RECENT EXPLORATIONS IN PALESTINE.

BY SELAH MERRILL, D.D., LL.D., ANDOVER, MASS.

THE progress of discoveries during the past fifty years has been simply marvellous. Africa is no longer a "Dark Continent;" the mounds on the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates have yielded up a rich and varied literature of a great people whose real history had been buried for ages; Asia Minor, Italy, Greece and her many islands, have disclosed to us forgotten civilizations and arts; Egypt has revealed a wonderful life in dynasties so remote that they must be dated chiefly by guess; and at the eastern end of the Mediterranean Philistia, Phœnicia, Edom, Moab, Bashan, and the Land of Israel on the west of the Jordan have been examined, measured, and excavated for monuments and other evidences that would illustrate their former intelligence, power, and wealth. In this good work, which has been carried on both by enterprising individuals and by regularly organized societies, almost every civilized nation has had a share, and in the results accomplished the whole world ought to rejoice.

This unusual activity in this comparatively new department of human investigation seems to indicate, to confine our attention to Bible lands, that a kind of confirmatory evidence is now demanded which preceding generations of wise and able men did not appear to need; they relied upon arguments; we appeal to monuments.

As to Palestine, we ought to consider the fact that the country now is practically safe in every part, whereas not a quarter of a century ago to visit certain sections of it one must do so at the risk of his life. No doubt this has stimulated explorers to enter its less known regions, for it need not be said that men are more likely to visit interesting places when it can be done with safety.

As one who has been actively engaged in this general work for nearly two decades, I will refer to a fact which has always seemed to me a little singular: allusion is made to the popular enthusiasm in it on the one hand, and to the lack of popular support of it on the other. People at home, and in Palestine even, have thought and often said that an organized society, backed by many prominent names, must have at command ample resources for all its needs. The truth lies in just the opposite direction; so far as the German, English, and American societies are concerned, they have from the outset been limited, hindered, and interrupted in their operations by a lack of necessary funds. A large number of persons have been thoroughly interested in the work, but they belong to a class that can never contribute much money to such an object, however important it may seem to them to be; while railroad magnates, merchant princes, wealthy bankers and manufacturers have withheld their support because they could see no tangible balance-sheet results in ruins, stones, inscriptions, or anything else that might be found or excavated in a far-off, old, and dead world. Here is an obstacle in the exploration of Eastern lands which the public seldom consider, an obstacle that does not arise from hostile governments, savage men, or unfavorable climates. An individual providing his own means and responsible to himself alone has more freedom, but his work is necessarily limited and fragmentary; on the other hand, a society has a wider scope and more is expected of it; men supposed to be qualified for special departments are chosen, and greater and more complete results are accomplished; hence the wisdom of putting this kind of work into the hands of such organizations. These remarks are made on the supposition which seems to me to be a just one, that the exploration of Eastern countries is yet in its infancy, notwithstanding all that has hitherto been done.

If it has required a struggle for the different societies to raise funds for such operations as they have been able to carry on, the men in the field have likewise had to struggle with many annoyances, hindrances, obstacles, and hardships that cannot and perhaps should not be rehearsed in detail. However, in the nature of the work itself, there is a large measure of compensation for all the dangers and vexations to which one may be exposed. Still it is severe work, and not infrequently health gives way or life is sacrificed. The whole number of explorers in Palestine has been small, but the list of the dead embraces the names, so far as they occur to me, of Dale, Costigan, Molyneaux, Richter, Roth, Drake, and Duncan.

If we could take an inventory of our knowledge respecting Palestine for the year 1890 and contrast the same with what was known of it a quarter of a century, perhaps I ought to say half a century ago, the result would be surprising even to those who are tolerably familiar with the subject. From being largely an unknown country, with its mountains, valleys, rivers, and cities placed at random on the now quaint old maps, it has become one of the best known, and its map equals that of the ordnance survey of England for fulness and accuracy of detail. Owing to certain favorable circumstances, the matter of surface delineation has been carried out more completely than any other department of research connected with the Holy Land; still the progress in other fields, as topography, geology, botany, natural history, archæology, and manners and customs, has been no less remarkable. We know its ancient history more perfectly than we know that of any other country; no section of it can now be said to be a strange land; and ample means exist, so that any one may become intimately acquainted with its physical features, its climate and resources, and its life in every phase of its varied character.

The remark can here be added that there is no longer any excuse for the crude statements which are constantly being thrust before the public—dragoman's stories, conclusions from hasty observations, assertions based on preconceived notions of how matters should be, careless and reckless guesswork as to the country and people, statements and assertions which bear the same relations to the real facts that falsehood does to truth. An illustration is at hand from a recent work of fiction* relating to the times of Christ, in which the high priest at Jerusalem is made to have a summer resort at Capernaum, a place whence, on account of the terrible heat, everybody who was able fled at that season; in which moreover some of the characters are said to be drenched with rain in a violent storm in summer on the sea of Galilee, whereas it never rains in that country between the months of April and October. These are but two out of hundreds of examples of misrepresentations that are to be found in travellers' letters and in too many modern books on the Holy Land. Similar misrepresentations respecting England or Germany would not be tolerated for a moment. While many are the result of ignorance, in some instances I have no doubt persons are led into making misleading statements from a desire to find in the country of to-day illustrations of the facts and events of the Bible. This is a laudable purpose, but the attempt is frequently abused, and should never be undertaken by those whose knowledge of Palestine consists of odds and ends of information that have been picked up at random. The purpose, as I have stated, is a laudable one, and to enforce this fact, Dr. William M. Thomson once said to me, "The people who read books on Palestine demand Biblical illustrations; you must try to make the results of all your explorations and researches illustrate that one book." In exemplification of these words this eminent man, in his work, "The Land and the Book," has written the only classic on the subject to be found in the English language.

Another quotation will bring this matter of exploration before us in another light. Within three years past a gentleman, speaking in good faith, put to me the following question: "Has a single fact, place, or thing been ascertained definitely with regard to the life of Christ?" This man was a graduate of one of the two largest colleges in New England, and in the legal profession holds a prominent place in one of our great cities. His attention had never been called seriously to this subject, and from some source he had received the impression that everything connected with the life of Christ was in hopeless obscurity and chaos. His deep interest in the facts and confirmations I was able to lay before him in our half-hour's conversation showed him to be a type of man far different from that which the apparently stupid question that I have quoted from his lips would indicate him to be. This bit of experience is a hint at least that in this work we have accumulated a vast amount of confirmatory evidence for the Bible which can be used to carry conviction of its truth to intelligent minds.

---

* "Come Forth." Boston, 1891.

Of the different departments where researches have been made it is not easy to tell which is the most interesting. If we begin with archæology, we find a monument which assures us that in Biblical history as early as 900 B.C. we are on firm ground. The rebellion of Mesha, the powerful King of Moab, against Israel after the death of Ahab, and the alliance against him of Jehoram, King of Israel, Jehoshaphat, King of Judah, and the King of Edom, as recorded in 2 Kings 3, are confirmed by the contemporary inscription on the Moabite stone which was found in 1868. The story of its recovery and singular fate, with which the world is now familiar, reads like a romance. The Phœnician characters in which the inscription is written, as well as the history and geography which it contains, give it among the records of Palestine a priceless value.

We pass on two hundred years, and in the time of King Hezekiah (726–697) we have the remarkable inscription from the Siloam tunnel at Jerusalem, inscribed to commemorate the completion of that ancient piece of engineering skill. For linguistic and palæographic purposes both these monuments have already been of great service to the world. It is interesting to note that this inscription was found accidentally by a boy from a Protestant mission school in Jerusalem (1880), and also that we are indebted to Rev. F. A. Klein, a Protestant missionary in the same city, for the discovery of the famous stone of Dibon, generally known by the name given above. Moreover, the third monument of this kind that I shall mention, the Gezer boundary stone, which marked the limit of an ancient levitical city, and the extreme western point of the territory of Ephraim (Josh. 21 : 21 ; 1 Chron. 7 : 28), was brought to light by a farmer, a Protestant gentleman whose father was a converted Jew and a well-known banker in the Holy City.

Connected with inscriptions, the next most important discovery was likewise made by accident. I refer to the stone from the partition wall in the Jewish temple. At intervals on this low wall there were pillars or slabs erected on which was inscribed a warning to all foreigners not to enter farther into the sacred inclosure than the line they marked. The penalty for violation was the death of the offender. One of these slabs, with seven lines of inscription, was recovered in 1871, so that we have a veritable sign-post that was described by Josephus, and later by the authors of the Mishna.

In the department of archæology should be included the Jewish and other ancient coins that for the most part have been dug out of the earth. As authentic and reliable monuments, I consider that far more might be made of them than has hitherto been done in illustrating and confirming important facts in the history of Palestine. The Jews began to coin money under Judas Maccabeus, B.C. 141–135, and from that time on till the beginning of the reign of Herod the Great, in B.C. 37, we have one hundred and eleven of these minute but precious objects, with their great variety of designs, inscriptions, forms of Hebrew letters, and other peculiarities, each of which is a lesson in the life of the Jewish nation.

Belonging to the different Herods who formed the ruling family in that country from B.C 37 till about 100 A.D.—that is, until the death of Herod Agrippa II., embracing the names of Herod the Great, his sons Archelaus, Antipas, and Philip II., and the two Agrippas—we have 105 coins. For Judea alone, which during a part of the same period, or from A.D. 6 to A.D. 70, was under Roman governors called Procurators, we have twenty-three coins. They constitute what are termed "The Procurator Series"—that is, coins that were struck in Judea by these officers, or possibly by the Jews, under the Emperors Augustus, Tiberius, Claudius, and Nero. During the period of the first revolt of the Jews, A.D. 66–A.D. 70, known as the Jewish War with Rome, we have twelve coins with purely Jewish designs and Hebrew letters. Under the different Roman emperors from A.D. 70 to the end of that century—Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian—we have seventy-nine coins ; and it is on these that, by the symbol of a captive chained at the foot of a palm-tree within the famous inscription "Judea Capta," the conquerors kept before the world for a long time the memory of their great victory over the stubborn Jewish people—symbols of glory to the Romans, but of national dishonour and ruin to the Jews. In the second Jewish revolt under Hadrian, A.D. 132–135, the Jews exercised their freedom again as to coining money, a privilege withheld from them by their masters so far as silver and gold coinage was concerned, and we have of these three or four years forty-three coins with Jewish symbols and legends. To all these I might add from the coinage of the Roman emperors from A.D. 100 to A.D. 260, the large number of 104 coins which illustrate the history and condition of Palestine, chiefly of Jerusalem, during that time, very many of which bear the inscription "Ælia Capitolina," evidence of the transformation that had taken place in the Holy City, and of the humiliation which it had suffered.

Here is a surprising catalogue of scarcely less than five hundred coins, reminding us of the struggles of the brave Maccabees in their efforts to shake off the Syrian yoke, and to become an independent people ; of the rise of the Herods from an Idumean family, men of power who combined a genius for government with terrible profligacy in morals ; of the agony of the nation in two conflicts with Rome—conflicts so great and destructive that the hills of Judea were drenched with Jewish blood, so vast was the number of the slain ; of the blotting out of the sanctuary of Jehovah, even of the name of the city so dear to its loyal sons, and the substitution therefor of heathen name, temple, altar, and customs ; reminding us in many ways of the varied life and checkered history of that wonderful people, its hopes not fulfilled, its fears more than realized, and of its tragic death and extinction so far as its political existence could be said to die.

I have not mentioned the coinage of the different cities and towns of Palestine that were allowed by the Romans to issue money (copper only) with their own stamp upon it, of which during the Roman period we have between 1500 and 2000 coins ; nor do I include in the foregoing estimates the coins of Tyre and Sidon, although in history, commerce, and in many other ways they were intimately connected with Palestine and its inhabitants.

To the department now being considered should be assigned the large number of inscriptions that belong, in general, to the early centuries of our era. It is only an approximate figure, but I will say that 2000 such records have been collected from different parts of Palestine, chiefly from the country east of the Jordan. Most of them are written in Greek, with a few in Latin, and this number makes no account of the Nabathean (Southeastern Semitic), the Palmyrene (Northeastern Semitic), the early Cufic, the Hamath inscriptions from the north, which are still strange to scholars and their secrets unrevealed, nor of those recently reported from the country south of Palestine, nor yet of those from Assyria and Egypt which relate to the Holy Land. Confining our attention to those from the country itself, it would be difficult to exaggerate their importance for language, primitive Christian life, Roman rule, and many other matters connected with its earlier history. Very many of these precious inscriptions are broken and mutilated, and the difficulty of reading such fragments and giving them their proper interpretation will be fully appreciated by those who have ever undertaken this kind of work ; much time and wonderful patience are required, for the process of unfolding their messages is a slow one ; but the facts already brought to the surface are invaluable, and from this source alone a flood of light has been shed on the places and peoples of ancient Palestine.

Still another class of monuments remains to be mentioned under the present general head—that is, the uninscribed records of remote ages and peoples. In several places east of the Jordan I have found cyclopean work, huge boulders or great blocks of unhewn stone piled into walls for defence, and in various sections of that interesting half of Palestine rude stone structures abound, so that Menhirs and Dolmens are numbered by the hundred. In western Palestine the most ancient monuments have been destroyed, but we still have multitudes of sarcophagi, some of which are ornamented with beautiful carved work, dating not only from the Roman, but from earlier periods ; we have ancient Jewish tombs, so numerous that we are perfectly familiar with the Hebrew mode of sepulture ; elegantly patterned mosaics from Roman and early Christian houses ; pottery, both that which antedates the time of Christ and much more from subsequent epochs ; iridescent glass, the wonder and admiration of all modern beholders, whose exquisite tints cannot be described in words ; relics of the Tenth Legion which, with the Fifth, Twelfth, and Fifteenth, took a prominent part in the siege of Jerusalem, and later for a long time did garrison duty about the city they had conquered ; and even a head of a statue of the Emperor Hadrian, under whom in A.D. 132–135, as has already been mentioned, the second Jewish revolt against Rome took place.

Still further, we have at Jerusalem round the Temple area large sections of its supporting wall, one of the most stupendous works of antiquity, that was built by Herod the Great, and at the southeast angle other portions that have been supposed to belong to the Solomonic era ; we have also the remains of an ancient Herodian bridge that led to the southern suburbs of the city, and of the causeway which formed the main avenue between the Temple hill and Mount Zion. We have parts of the third, or Agrippa's Wall ; also of the second wall, outside of which our Lord was crucified, and a vast scarped rock which belonged to the earliest fortifications of this once famous stronghold. We have the foundations of at least two of the towers erected by Herod the Great in honor of his friends, also those of the Castle of Antonia, where Paul was confined before being taken to Cesarea, and even the Xystus has been uncovered, a place memorable in connection with the wicked life of Antiochus Epiphanes (B.C. 176–164), who endeavored to debauch the minds of the Hebrew youth, so that they would turn away from the faith of their fathers. Moreover, recent examinations have been so thorough and minute that we are now able to give the exact history of the famous Mosque of Omar and that of El Aksa, to name their principal builders, and to show that Constantine had nothing to do with the one or Justinian with the other.

About Jerusalem we have Absalom's Pillar, the Pyramid of Zacharias, and a little below these, in the village of Siloam (*Silwan*), another similar monument, all cut out of the solid rock, strange objects of a bygone age, whose purpose and exact date cannot yet be determined. With the Siloam aqueduct of Hezekiah's reign, to which reference has been made, should be mentioned that of Pilate, which brought water to the city from Solomon's Pools, also those near the same line, dating from an earlier period, and likewise the extensive works of this kind of which remains still exist in Bashan, Gilead, and in the Jordan Valley. At Beersheba we have a well dating from the time of Abraham, and at Shechem another from the time of Jacob. In Galilee, at Tell Hum, Irbid, Kefr Birim, and elsewhere, we have remains of the veritable synagogues in which the Jews worshipped in the second if not in the first century of our era. At Arak el Emir, east of the Jordan, we can still point to Hyrcanus' palace, with its massive "bevelled" stones, nearly two hundred years older than the time of Christ (B.C. 180), and at Hebron to the magnificent Jewish work in the mausoleum that was erected, probably by the Jewish kings, around the burial-place of Abraham.

The foregoing is a rapid but by no means a complete enumeration of the material at hand to-day in a single department of Palestinian research. In the limits of the present article it would be impossible to give more than a hint of its great importance as confirmatory evidence of many facts of Bible history, nor is there space even to dwell at similar length on any of the other equally fascinating departments in which extensive and careful researches have been made.

The matter of the topographical recovery of Palestine—that is, the identification of ancient sites—is a vast one, and full of interest to the student of the Bible. There are 622 Biblical names which belong to the western half of the country, and of these about two-thirds have been ascertained with a fair degree of certainty. The work of identification is both easy and difficult. For example, with such names as Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Hebron, Nazareth, and many others, no question is raised—there is nothing to be decided ; but there is a large class of instances which require great care, combined with personal examinations of the ground itself, before we can be sure that a proposed identification is correct.

It is well known that tradition has done much to throw Biblical topography into confusion. Its law in selecting sites is convenience, without regard to historical accuracy or even of probability. Had we only this source of evidence to rely upon, the task of identification would be a hopeless one. On the other hand, tradition is not to be despised, and we find that where there is a concensus of Christian, Mohammedan, and Jewish tradition, the case is entitled to our careful consideration.

In some cases, where names are wanting, the probabilities are so strong as to amount to certainty. The region itself when personally examined—this work cannot be done at a distance, even from the best maps—furnishes what I call topographical reasons why one point proposed for a given site must be rejected and another accepted. This is the case with the sites of the cities of the plain, which, according to all the evidence that can be collected, were situated at the north end of the Dead Sea, and this identification will hold good unless, what is very unlikely, stronger objections than any that have yet been presented can be brought against it.

Certain places occupy, as already hinted, the identical sites which they did in Bible times, while others have migrated, as, for instance, Sarepta or Zarephath, once an important town on the sea-coast, but at present it is at a considerable distance inland in a safer locality among the hills. Another instance is that of Jericho, which has had three different sites each a mile distant from either of the others.

Sometimes out of an apparently trivial circumstance comes an exceedingly interesting discovery. It is well known that in the earliest times the Jordan Valley was occupied by the Canaanites, and while working there near the river Jabbok, which crosses the plain from the east, I heard the Arabs in my employ use the word *Kena'an*, applying it to a certain fording place. This name which, so far as I know, I was the first to recover, appears to be nothing less than a relic of the people who flourished there before the time of Joshua. The importance of this name as a historical link connecting us with the remote past of that country can be seen at a glance.

While we are near the Jabbok I will allude to the identification of Succoth. Beth-aram, Beth-nimrah, Succoth, and Zaphon in the Jordan Valley were assigned to the tribe of Gad (Josh. 13 : 27). The two first are located on the Shittim Plain opposite Jericho, the next oasis to the north being that around the mouth of the Jabbok. The Jerusalem Talmud states that Succoth was called Deir Alla. A large mound just north of the Jabbok bears the name Tell Deir 'Alla, and on it are ruins. Captain Warren once rode through this valley and found this name, but was wholly unaware of its significance. My own part in the matter was to find the passage in the Talmud and apply it to this mound, and moreover to show that all the requirements of the Bible narrative are met in this identification. Here in this beautiful pasture ground Jacob tarried on his return from Padan-aram.

The following examples will illustrate the need there is in this work of the greatest care and, where that is possible, of the judgment of more than one individual. After the conquest of the country under Joshua, when the two and a half tribes returned to their homes east of the Jordan, they built an altar, and the act nearly cost a civil war (Josh. 22). A few years since Palestine scholars were astonished by the announcement of the discovery of this altar called "Ed." It was said to be situated on the summit of a sharp peak known as Kurn Sartabeh, a conspicuous object overlooking the Jordan Valley on the west of the river, where there are extensive remains of an old fortress. The moment, however, that the proposition was carefully examined it was shown that the altar in question was erected on the east side of the Jordan, and that for other reasons the proposition was wholly groundless. The second example is in connection with the word "Pisgah," long supposed to indicate a peak in the mountains of Moab east of the Jordan where Moses stood just before his death. A French traveller found the name "Siaghah" and inserted it in his map of that region. Later, another visitor to this locality claimed to have discovered the name Siaghah, and made the attempt to show that it represented the Pisgah of the Bible. Siaghah, however, was not "the top of the hill," as required by Deut. 34 : 1, but was applied to a smaller and lower summit of the range. Subsequently another visitor showed, among other objections to this identification, that as the word *siaghah* on the west of the Jordan had to do with goldsmiths and their work, it was very improbable that on the east of the Jordan it should be a relic of an old Bible name which had no such meaning. Still later the Rev. George E. Post, M.D., Professor in the Syrian Protestant College, Beirut, a master of both the classic and the spoken Arabic, visited this region in 1886, and he has since shown it to be absolutely impossible for Siaghah to represent the Hebrew word Pisgah. Moreover, some Hebrew scholars doubt if Pisgah should be regarded as a proper name; they would take it to mean "hill," as in the margin of the Authorized Version, and would read, "Moses went up to Mount Nebo—top of the hill." Hence, from anything that has yet appeared, there has been no identification of Pisgah, even if there is really any such place to identify. This case is mentioned because of its interesting character, and because it affords an illustration of how carefully a proposed identification must be examined by different scholars before it is accepted.

Toward defining the boundaries of the tribal divisions of Palestine much has been done, but this has always been puzzling work, owing to our uncertain knowledge of the location of the many border towns which marked the limits of each tribe. This subject cannot here be enlarged upon, therefore I will mention but a single point, which is to me of special interest. In Joshua 15 : 7–9, the boundary of Judah is being described, and of one portion we read, "The goings out thereof were at En-rogel: and the border went up by the valley of the son of Hinnom unto the south side of the Jebusite; the same is Jerusalem: and the border went up to the top of the mountain that lieth before the valley of Hinnom westward, which is at the end of the valley of the giants northward: and the border was drawn from the top of the hill," etc. In studying this subject I have frequently walked over this ground, and I am certain that no surveyor, no deed of land that was scrupulously exact in its details, could define the boundary more definitely than it is here done in the Book of Joshua. My inference is that if the line can be verified in this part, it may be in every other part, and so might all the boundary lines of all the tribes; the difficulty in so doing cannot be charged to inexact descriptions in the records, but to our imperfect knowledge. In my judgment this work could not have been done centuries subsequent to the events described, but must have been done by contemporary writers who were perfectly familiar with the places mentioned and with the lines laid down; it must have been done for the people then actually occupying the soil, and who were personally interested in the various subdivisions of their newly acquired country.

This rapid review which has been given to archæology and topography ought to be extended to the birds and animals of the Holy Land, to its reptiles, insects, and fishes, to the various and interesting phases of its climate, to the geological formation and history of the country and the mineral treasures of its ancient hills, to the trees, plants, grains, seeds, and flowers that carpet with beautiful colors its stony fields, and to the manners and customs of its inhabitants, which, to a certain degree, give us pictures of its former social habits and domestic life. Each of these departments is extensive and rich, and skilful workers are gathering from these many sources a surprising amount of illustrative material, evidence valuable in many ways, but which brings out with wonderful clearness the fact that to the writers of the Bible the earth, sky, air, sea, men, and living creatures of Palestine were familiar objects, and so used by them as to make inseparable the Divine Revelation and the Land of its origin.

A NOVEL way to indicate acceptance of a call to a pastorate was illustrated recently in the case of a local church, the chairman of whose supply committee received a telegram with the words—Ruth 1 : 16 : "Thy people shall be my people." The reply which went back over the wire was, "And all the people said Amen." That pastor and his flock evidently purpose to begin their relations on a Scriptural basis.—*Congregationalist.*

WE may say of man, in Emerson's words, "Himself from God he could not free." He cannot escape God any more than he can escape the horizon or his own heart-beat. No matter what your theory may be, God is the most real reality of life. This word has not been, and is not now, a dogmatic limitation. The God ideal and religion are two factors of human life so large that they cannot be ignored or left out of the platform of any movement that proposes to be wide enough for the growing life of humanity to stand upon.—*M. J. Savage.*

SEVENTEEN REASONS WHY I AM A UNITARIAN.

BY REV. N. M. MANN, OMAHA, NEB.

From *Unity*, Chicago, January 29, 1891.

> Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you (1 Peter 3 : 15).

WE have heard from our fathers that the sermon in their day often extended through several hours, having sometimes as many as sixteen divisions and subdivisions. But now the patience of listeners has fallen off, the sermon is cut down to thirty minutes and the old elaboration is impracticable; so that, whereas the preacher of other days ventured boldly upon his fifteenthly and sixteenthly, we are glad if we can be sure of making even one point, and seldom go beyond secondly or thirdly. It is, therefore, with some misgiving that I come before you with a discourse that divides itself under seventeen heads—that is, as many heads as the celebrated beast in the apocalypse had heads and horns together.

In other words, I propose to give that number of the more striking reasons for being a Unitarian.

1. If one were to ask me, "Why are you a white man?" I could only say, "I was born so, and I do not see that I have any business to go and paint myself black like the negro, or red like the Indian." So my first reason for being a Unitarian is that God made me that way, and I do not feel that it belongs to me to try to undo His work. It is my opinion that He makes everybody else the same way, and that in the multitude of instances, the natural bent of the mind is perverted by education. The doctrines of Unitarianism, as I understand them, are the doctrines of natural religion—the conclusions to which the reverent thinker naturally comes. A leading churchman said to me the other day: "As regards religion, the scientific world seems to stand substantially upon your ground;" which is true enough. Our theology requires no stretch of credulity—it is just that which reasonable minds, if they entertain any belief at all, cannot help having. It is that to which intelligence is led instinctively and perforce. People accept it, not by an act of faith as something incredible, but because they cannot help it. It is the ground on which thoughtful, reverent souls naturally stand—on which they *must* stand in default of good reason for going elsewhere. It is, therefore, a rational and cogent, though neg-

ative explanation of our position, to say that we have not been convinced of the fitness of taking any other position. As the Orthodox say, we have not been "converted from the error of our ways." But, so long as we are open to conviction and seeking after the truth, I see not how this want of conversion to any one of the creeds is any fault of ours. If we simply *can't* believe them, what is there to be done about it?

2. To advance to positive reasons, I say, in the second place, that Unitarianism as a belief in the unity of God rests on evidences in nature. The uniformity of law is the final proof that the Ruling Power is one, and not many, whole, and not divided. If water ran down-hill in one country and up-hill in another, if the arithmetic of one continent did not hold on other continents, or if the consciences of the different races reported entirely different moral codes, there would be reason to think that there is more than one controlling Power. If there were found to be one natural order, and another, supernatural order, the fact would point strongly in the same way. Whatever miracles indicated in the days when they were supposed to take place, they carry with them now the suggestion of a plurality of gods. The course of nature, in which every effect has its sufficient natural cause, must be taken as the manifestation of one divinity; whereas the arrest of that order would seem to be the work of other divinities. Satan could do some wonders, and Satan was really a god, though of evil disposition. But the conviction which is laying strong hold upon the modern mind that the natural order is never broken, that a miracle is a downright impossibility, closes the last door upon the polytheistic idea. The more we learn of nature, the more the evidences multiply that the power over all and through all and in all is one power, and not two or three or more powers. One set of principles extend to every minutest structure that the microscope reveals; and the telescope shows the law of gravitation operating in systems inconceivably remote, just as it operates here. Nature preaches the unity of the Eternal Power.

3. More than this, I would say, thirdly, that the ancient prophets of Israel taught that "God is one and His name one." The earlier prophets did admit, it is true, that there were other gods, and only claimed for Jehovah that he was the greatest of all. But in the days when prophecy rose to its noblest form, the notion that other gods had any actual existence was renounced, and Jehovah was reckoned Lord, not of Israel, only but of all the earth. Great emphasis was laid upon the *oneness* of this Being. We are never told that he exists in three persons, but the statement is iterated and reiterated beyond all need, as it seems to modern readers, that he is *one*. The decalogue, most venerated of the old Scriptures, is introduced with the solemn declaration. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord;" and from this idea the prophets never depart. If God exists in three persons they certainly never dreamed of it, nor have the Jews in ancient or modern times ever admitted such a thing, and it may be supposed that they, if anybody, would understand their own teachers.

4. It is to be said in the next place that Jesus also taught that God is one. The Jews were very tenacious on this point, but they never charged that his doctrine was at fault as regards the Divine Unity. He repeated with emphasis the old words "The Lord thy God is one Lord," and left not a single word to indicate that he had any modification to make of that saying, or any new doctrine of a tri-personality to introduce. The terms now so common, "God the Son," "God the Holy Ghost," "Trinity," "Triune God," were not invented in his time, nor does he use words having the slightest resemblance to these words, either in sound or sense. He speaks of God as "My Father and your Father," and shows him to us in an intensely personal and tender way, but it is always as one person, never as more than one. Jesus would have been the first to check the thought now so universal that he was himself God, and that worship should be paid to him. Did he not correct one for using a very mild word of praise?—"Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one; that is God!" And did he not teach men expressly to pray to the Father, providing a form of words in which no other name occurs? Beyond a question his doctrine in this regard was summed up in what seems to have been a formula of the earliest church: "To us there is but one God, the Father."

5. In most quarters it would be enough to show for a doctrine that is taught in both the Old and New Testaments, but I have further reasons to adduce. Antiquity has other testimonies beside those that come from the people of Israel, which, if not so clear, may be counted on the same side. Greek philosophers and Roman moralists generally speak of God as one being. Reading Plato, or Seneca, or Epictetus, we find

them Unitarians. They came to believe in one God, without influence from Jerusalem. The views of these great men, who were earnest seekers after truth, are entitled to great weight, and the fact that they, and others like them, arrived at definite notions of the Divine Unity in the midst of a popularly accepted polytheism, sufficiently justifies a reference to them as authorities in some such sense as the Hebrew prophets were. It may have been the part of the Jews to teach monotheism to the world, but before they got ready to teach it, the best minds had already found it out. To none of these minds, however, any more than to the prophets, or to Jesus, did it appear that God was manifest in three persons.

6. In the sixth place, I am a Unitarian because in the simple unity of God I find a consistent, intelligible conception. This is certainly more than can be said of the notion presented in the current creeds. There we are told of a Divine Unity, which, at the same time, is a Trinity, of three persons, who are yet the same person, of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, each of whom is God, and each a distinct person. At the same time we are told that there are not three Gods, but one God. Such another confused and confusing idea is hardly to be found in all the annals of human thought. How it keeps its hold in theology is a marvel, the secret of which doubtless lies in the unfathomable mystery which surrounds the whole subject of the Divine existence. Probably it appears to many minds that such an incomprehensible subject is best referred to and stated in language that defies comprehension; that the supreme mystery ought to be couched in mysterious phraseology. But if there is a topic on which we cannot speak without using language that is self-contradictory, why say anything on that topic? Does it really help any toward an understanding of a deep subject to use words which convey no thinkable idea? Such a proceeding is certainly entirely foreign to the method of Jesus. When he spoke of God he was careful to be very simple and intelligible. Why people who look to him as the author and finisher of their faith should seek to improve on his method, is not easy to see. His constant formula for the Divine Mystery is, "Our Father in Heaven," "My Father and your Father." No blind, enigmatic epithets, no seeking to match the mysterious Reality with mysterious terms, no confusing the intellect with talk about three persons in one God.

7. Another reason for being a Unitarian is that the Trinity infinitely exaggerates the importance of earth and man. This is an argument that they will understand who have some notion of the immensity of the universe and the relative insignificance of the planet on which we live. Let those who have contemplated these tremendous facts turn from them to that idea of the Creator presented in the current creeds, and they will have trouble enough. For the Trinity is suited to that notion of the universe that makes this earth the central and all important body; the three persons of whom it is composed having their several offices solely with reference to this world. The instant you begin to think of the globe on which we live being but an infinitesimal speck of the entire creation, that theory looks strangely disproportionate. How an astronomer, accustomed to peer through the vastnesses about us, and familiar with the thought of an endless succession of suns and worlds, more in number than the drops of the ocean, can entertain the thought that the Eternal Maker and Sustainer of them all was actually born upon this earth, lived here thirty odd years, playing the games of childhood, working at carpentry, finally preaching awhile and perishing upon the cross—how these incongruous conceptions can have place in the sane mind, has always seemed to me among the most unaccountable of mental eccentricities. The doctrine of the Trinity was devised in the days when it was universally supposed that this earth was in every sense of the word the centre of the universe. That God himself was born among men and lived here, was not an incredible proposition under that view. But modern astronomy has annihilated that notion of the universe, and the church is left with a doctrine as incompatible with the science of to-day as is the philosopher's stone or the astrologer's key to the futurity.

8. My argument thus far has borne only upon that particular tenet from which Unitarianism historically takes its name. But it has other features that commend it, and to these we must now pass. Its doctrine of the Unity of God is supplemented by a doctrine of the Unity of Man. There is the Fatherhood; there is also the Brotherhood. These are easy words to say—everybody is saying them; so I shall not rest upon the mere statement, but proceed to point out how our convictions and actions are influenced by this doctrine of the Brotherhood of Man. It will thus be shown to be not a mere vapid sentiment. When we represent to ourselves mankind as God's children, we feel compelled to assume the very highest type of family relationship. The father

must have an equal affection for all his children, giving to each strictly according to deserts. In other words, he will not have any pets in his household, or show the slightest partiality. Applying this view, it at once follows that the Father of men has not singled out any one race of the world's inhabitants as his special care, revealing himself exclusively to them. This would be a shocking conception of his dealing with his family. Whatever superiority the Jew had in the old time, he earned. There was no arbitrary selection of him to the neglect of the rest. He had his revelations ; other races had theirs, differing according to their various stages of growth. So when Buddha counsels men to love one another, it is just as good precept as when it comes from Jewish sources. The sentiment of the Golden Rule is the same whether we have it from Confucius, or Hillel, or Jesus. The law of benevolence and righteousness, as enunciated by Mencius, is just as sacred, just as authoritative, as it is when coming from the lips of prophet or apostle. This is one way in which we make practical application of the doctrine of human brotherhood. Man is God's child whichever side of a continent he is on, and it will not do to say that to one race alone the oracles have been committed. This view modifies our attitude toward the non-Christian world at the present time. It tempers our zeal for missionary work in foreign fields, and now that we are entering upon that work, we have to entirely revolutionize its methods. We feel that we must address ourselves to Japanese, Hindoos, Siamese, and others as to brothers who are pretty sure to have something to tell us, so that the instruction will not be all on one side. We do not go out with the egotistic notion that we have all the light and they all the darkness. That method has proved very unproductive and very expensive, and has only succeeded at all because it is usually accompanied by a fanatical and fiery zeal. If we call men our brothers, consistency requires that we should not assume an immeasurable superiority over them.

9. I like Unitarianism, in the next place, because it encourages the noblest endeavor. It says, without reservation : What man has done, man can do. No eminence of true greatness has been reached that is not yet accessible. The glorious lights of the past are not set merely to dazzle our eyes, or to tempt us to impossibilities ; they show us what achievements are forever within the reach of the children of men. Isaiah is not so sublime, or Paul so devoted, or Jesus so good, that the world can never see their like again. Between them and the world from which they sprung there is no impassable barrier. The child may be sleeping in his cradle now who will have graces and gifts equal to any one of the Bible heroes. We are all of the common human brotherhood, and the glories with which one of our fellows is crowned, reveal to us the range of our own possibilities. We, too, may eventually become like him ; but it may take more than this lifetime. For the race, however, the possibility remains of reproducing such a character at any time. The divine man, we may be sure, has not ceased to appear ; he will come again and again, unless the race has passed its prime, which does not appear likely. If the golden age is before us, as we think, the world has not yet seen its greatest or its best souls. The future may outdo the past in spiritual as effectually as in material things.

10. In the tenth place, I am a Unitarian because it is possible in that connection to have a natural, reasonable notion of what the Bible is. We are enabled to see that it is the surviving literature of a nation, having its peculiarities, its matchless excellencies, but still corresponding to the sacred books of other nations, and produced in the perfectly natural way in which all books have been produced. That is to say, it is a legitimate outcome of the human mind and heart, not a miraculous book dropped down from heaven, or a book written in some magical way, such as never was known before or since. Supernatural book-making is a serious stumbling-block to the modern mind. It is an immense relief to be delivered from the necessity of believing in any such thing.

11. From this follows my eleventh justification of the hope and the faith that are in me. Unitarianism teaches the adequacy of the human faculties. We are mentally as well as physically equipped for the emergencies of our mortal lot. Reason and conscience are not lures, as some seem to teach, to lead us on to perdition, but faithful guides, competent to answer, as far as need be, the questions that come before them. This is an article of faith, which seems to me to be of incalculable worth. To feel that Nature is dealing fairly with us, laying requirements upon us according to our capacity ; to feel that the laws of thought which dominate our minds are wide-reaching as the universe, and underlie the very structure of the worlds ; that the reason, the heart and the conscience are so august a tribune that from their decision there is no appeal, lends a sense of dignity to human na-

ture which is at once an element of strength and of joy. The consciousness of weakness and of sin has its place and its uses, but if we are to be men and women, we must also have a consciousness of power and adequacy to our tasks. We are bound to respect and honor the faculties that God has given us, however we may be compelled to admit our misuse of them. He has given us the power to discern what is right and what is true, and this power he has given us to use, if anything has a purpose or a meaning. A saying which everyone will do well to put away in his memory for future reflection is this: "When God made thee, he *meant* thee." The possession of a faculty is the warrant for the use of it. So we do not hesitate to apply reason to religion; it is the province of reason to free us from our errors and to lead us into truth. And to have this faith in human nature that in it are the springs of all perfections, that it has upward as well as downward possibilities, that it is a perfect law to itself, covers life and all its experiences with a new and brighter light. Human nature is the ship in which we are all floating. The question is whether we shall think of it as a condemned hulk, rickety and rotten, its compass pointing the wrong way, its officers and crew incompetent and bent on mischief, with no anchor and no boats, and nothing to depend on but the life-preserver, and the sea full of sharks —whether we shall think of it in that way, or as a stanch craft equipped for the voyage, able to take its direction and make for the distant port. For my part, as long as I am aboard this ship, I prefer to think well of it.

12. My twelfth justification of Unitarianism is, it welcomes all advances of thought. It is not living, as some other faiths seem to be, in constant apprehension that something will be found out by some inquisitive explorer that will overturn the whole foundation of theology. It supposes that all truths harmonize; that within the bounds of things conceivable one truth will never clash with another truth. So it says to the worlds of science and philosophy: Bring your discoveries; the church which guards the truth of God must be open to light from all sides, must be in the full blaze of intelligence lest it turn out that what it guards is not the truth after all. If anything new is found out bearing upon religious history, or upon any religious doctrine, the church should be the first to know it and to act upon it. That is the attitude of Unitarianism, and it is the attitude of no other church. Unitarianism does not tie itself inextricably to a stake that was driven a thousand, or a hundred, or even ten years ago. Its teachings grow and change with the growing and changing light. It does not propose to lead people blindfolded into heaven, but counsels them to keep their eyes open; they will see none too much. It has no confidence in that feat of legerdemain by which so many good people think to cheat themselves for their own good. Let us know the truth, we say, though the whole structure of the spiritual heavens fall. Atheism and annihilation are better than the suppression of the truth.

13. The next reason why I like Unitarianism is one that may go for little or nothing with others, or even be reckoned a decided objection. Tastes differ. I say, therefore, rather as a matter of personal preference, that I like this connection because it has not an army of solicitors confronting you at every turn—solicitors not only for your cash, but for your souls. I know this is often looked upon, even by ourselves, as a weakness. It is often said we appear too indifferent toward strangers who come into the church; we do not rush upon them with profuse greetings and fairly take them by storm; or, failing to secure instant capitulation, we do not pursue the intended victims to their homes and lay siege to them there, like importunate lovers, until, unable to resist such blandishments, they yield and come into the fold. This is a great art, worked out to perfection by people who really put their hearts in it as one of their religious duties—as one of the appointed means for the salvation of souls. But it is an art in which we can never excel. And I am glad of it. It is a piece of supererogation having no place in our system; and the fact that we are not up to it is not, as some think, a sign that we are cold and dead. It is no secret that the church is a public place, that the people of every church are very glad to see any person who may come in. Unitarians are just as delighted as others with an influx of new faces, but if any one waits to be floated into their circle on a sea of taffy, he will wait a good while. When I say I like this, I would not be understood as a defender of distant and freezing manners. I do not like to hear that people have occupied adjoining pews for years without speaking to each other. There is need enough of more cordiality, more recognition of the church relationship. But I do like that respect for individuality which secures a person from being swamped in a circle of people with whom, it may be, he has nothing in common, and whose at-

tentions to him, as he knows and as they know, are purely perfunctory.

14. Fourteenthly, Unitarianism has no curses for unbelievers. If you reject its doctrines, it does not reproach you. The doors out of this church, as the doors into it, swing easily. There are clergymen, prominent in other connections, who have been Unitarian ministers, and I have yet to hear of an instance where such withdrawal has been made a grievance, or broken the cordial relations before existing. This faith puts every man on his own conscience. It honors one who goes out with a clear conscience more than it does another who stays in without any conscience involved in the matter. I want to be of a church which, if ever the time should come that I should feel it my duty to go into the church of Rome, would not let me go without its genuine and right handed blessing on my head.

15. In the next place, I like this faith because it provides the widest fellowship. This may sound strangely when you consider how few we are in Omaha, how few in all this great West. But the church which is open to all souls places its members in practical fellowship with a great number of earnest, faithful persons of every profession. In any good work he is joined hand in hand with these. What is more, he is in fellowship with the spirit of the age, finds science and philosophy, poetry and art, making one cause with him—the epoch-making books of the time preaching his gospel. No other religionist is *en rapport* with the great authors as he is; no other can truly boast of having in his own ranks such a brilliant array of them. An enumeration of the Unitarian names famous in literature and in science would excite surprise, even among ourselves. Further than this, Unitarianism has a breadth greater, far, than the Christian name. It reaches over, and has a virtual fellowship beyond the Christian world. In their doctrine of God, the Jews are strictly Unitarians, as are also the Mohammedans. But this is less of a link than the universal religious sentiment which pervades so much of the old Oriental literature, making us sure that the hearts of hundreds of millions in the East have been keeping time through the ages to these pulse-beats of ours. The Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, though they be the best, are not the only ones that Asia has produced; and when the more complete Bible is edited, it will contain many a chapter that will take us back in gratitude and veneration to founders and apostles of faiths, whose very names are now strange to us.

16. And so I say, in the next place, that I like Unitarianism because it suggests a possibly universal faith. There is no reason to think that Christianity, in any of its popular forms, will ever become the religion of mankind. The antagonism of sect toward sect is an obstacle, but the chief impediment is an inability to see the good points in other religions, and establish sympathetic relations with them. The notion among them all is that there is one true religion, and that all others are false religions, and so must be cut up root and branch. In the days when forms of faith were forced upon nations at the point of the sword, this attitude of infinite superiority worked very well; but in peaceful propagandism it has not been successful. I do not imagine that our Liberal Christianity is going to march to a success where the great missionary churches have accomplished so little; but I do think that a Christian church which repudiates the old distinction of true and false religions, which finds something true and beautiful in all religions, points to a line of advance on which there may be some hope of bringing the world, if not to one confession, at least to one working fellowship.

17. Finally, I give as reason for preferring Unitarianism, the fact that it shines with a steady, not a fitful light. Its support, its inspirations, its hopes, fall all along the daily path of life, the same yesterday, to-day and forever. It rests upon rational grounds, and so is not subject to the uncertain ebb and flow of sentiment. The topics it brings for contemplation are plain matters of duty, or problems for calm and passionless thought. It unrolls no drama; it has no sensationalism. Its method is to cultivate, to admonish, to instruct. The sources of this helpfulness no more run dry than do the fountains of learning, or the perennial springs of poetry. Like Mencius before the king, the preacher of this faith has two themes good for all seasons—benevolence and righteousness; or if he makes excursions to other fields, he returns ever to these fundamentals. But this preaching produces no excitement. People do not come in throngs and crush each other in their eagerness to get within hearing of it. Nevertheless it keeps right on, summer and winter, one steady, unfailing flow, working over the simple permutations, benevolence and righteousness, righteousness and benevolence. It does not corruscate like a meteor or a comet, but has the constant radiance of the morning star, suggestive of the Eternal Calmness, and of a life which never goes out.

HINDOO CONSERVATISM.

From *The Spectator* (London), January 31, 1891.

The Orthodox Hindoos, who represent, of course, a great majority of Hindoos, are suffering in English opinion for their resistance to the new marriage law rather more than they should. They are seriously in the wrong, no doubt, for they ought to know by this time that their English rulers have no intention of upsetting their social system; and they ought to know, moreover, from their own experience, as well as from the teachings of science, that their custom of premature marriage is excessively injurious to the race. Their women are often hags at thirty-five, when they ought to be fat and well-looking, as hundreds among the Christian Indian women are; and the reason, as they ought to know, and, we believe, do know in a vague way, is premature motherhood. Nevertheless, they have several reasons other than mere conservatism, for their annoyance with the new bill; and it is only fair to them that the reasons should be plainly stated. In the first place, they are greatly irritated that the government should take upon itself to deal with the matter at all, and under the same circumstances so should we be. The whole question of marriage is, in Hindoo opinion, strictly a religious question, the possibility of escape from infinite and painful transmigrations being bound up in the chance of producing an heir in time to perform expiatory ceremonies; and to have the question regulated by powerful and wise outsiders who are not in the pale at all, who do not understand Hindoo thought and utterly despise Hindoo ritual, is naturally abhorrent to them. So would similar interference be to us if we were conquered by efficient but unsympathetic agnostics, who insisted, for example, on an inquiry into the health of all betrothed lovers, enacted that none should marry without proof of adequate means, and decreed that divorce at will was part of the unbreakable natural law. We should be twice as much hurt by such interference as by foreign taxation, or the abolition of Parliament; and the Hindoos, owing to their special belief about the religious necessity of producing heirs, are twice as much hurt as we should be. These domineering foreign men of science, they think, are imperilling in their blindness even our hopes of "salvation," and they are angry with an anger for which they can hardly find words.

Then the new law does place on fathers of families—and, remember, a bachelor Hindoo is an entity which cannot exist—a new and, as he thinks, grievous burden. He is as sensitive to the honor of his household as any English noble, and he has to guard it under circumstances the difficulty of which he knows well, though the English do not, for two additional years. He cannot place his daughter in a convent, as a Frenchman or a Spaniard would; he cannot keep her mind in half-light, as a European or American does; and he cannot alter at a blow all those circumstances of his civilization, his religion, his very dress, which tend to wake the passions prematurely. He has devised early marriage as a household protection, and to see it abolished by fiat from above without necessity, and for reasons he has not fully accepted, is almost an insult as well as an oppression. Above all, he resents the penal element in the new proposal, and he has reason to resent it. As originally proposed by the English reformers, the new law would have placed every household in India at the absolute mercy of the police, and would have caused and almost justified a popular insurrection, such as, in all their experience of India, the English have never had to face. Laws or no laws, Hindoo custom will compel the father of the bride to send her, at the age of about ten, to her husband's house—that is, in fact, to place her under the authority of her mother-in-law. She is safe enough there, in the majority of instances, as long as she remains a child; but if the husband were forbidden by law to approach her, the police would have a lever to work in pursuit of bribes such as would be absolutely irresistible. No household which did not bribe would have been safe for a day from the chance of a false charge, which could not have been so much as discussed without ruin to the honor of the family, which, be it remembered, includes a nearly perfect seclusion from intruding eyes. To the Hindoo, jealous to madness of ceremonial purity, on which, as he conceives, the happiness of his future lives depend, and drilled by centuries of foreign dominance to suspect oppression in the very breezes, his shrouded domestic life is all in all, the one thing in defence of which he will die, or be ruined; and to give the police the legal right of lifting the veil would have been to create thirty millions of Wat Tylers. Fortunately, the government, always kindly intentioned, understood that situation thoroughly, and in their bill carefully guarded against the possibility of its occurrence; but even now the liability of the Hindoo to what he thinks dishonor, is considerably increased by the reform. Family quarrels, when they break out in a Hindoo house, the theory of which is that it is a unit under patriarchal government, are inconceivably bitter, the jealousies among the women never end; and the whole arrangement of life tends to a savage dispute between the husband's wife and the husband's mother—between, that is, the claimant of honor within the house, and the claimant of authority. The new law, though it will not be felt in the immense majority of well-governed houses, will be felt, with cause, in the minority of houses honeycombed with domestic hatreds, and will be regarded in all with a certain distrust, as one from which, by possibility, police interference, and consequent inquiries by magistrates, and resulting discreditable trials in court, might conceivably spring. Malignant perjury is not in India, as in Europe, an infrequent and little-feared occurrence, but is perhaps the greatest and commonest of the dangers to which the rich are exposed, and which they fear to such a degree as to influence their most habitual actions—thousands of Hindoos, for example, never forgetting that an enemy may *see* their signatures, and therefore be in a position to produce a colorable imitation of them. The opportunity which the new law gives for such malignant perjury from within the household itself needs no explanation, and it is vain to hope that it will never, or scarcely ever, be taken advantage of. At all events, it will be dreaded.

For—and this is the great cause of Indian conservatism, which can never be cured while the world stands—the Indian imagination, besides being far more vivid than the European, is essentially pessimistic, gloomy, full of anticipation of possible or coming evil. Whatever the cause, be it race, or diet, or the menacing aspect of tropical nature, which always seems hostile to man and too strong for his resisting powers, the Indian's thought in the watches of the night is always full of fear, always represents to him terrors which in Europe are felt only by hypochondriacs. Every movement of his superiors is alarming, every action of his equals food for doubt; his very creed is a hope that he may escape existence, every detail of his ritual a deprecation of the wrath of unknown but supernatural powers. He is responsible for a hundred past lives of which he can remember nothing; and how does he know that in those lives he has not justified, by offences against the all-embracing Spirit, the falling of a hundred Towers of Siloe on his head? He pants for security, and finds it only in monotony, in the conception that life as it is was divinely arranged, in that permanent freedom from change in any direction, and especially freedom from change in all half-religions, half-social customs, which nowadays seems to the active classes of Europe—we do not believe in the universality of the feeling, and expect one day a rough awakening for innovators—to involve an intolerable weariness. Full of this horror, he makes of his life a continuity such as is hardly known in Europe, and falls constantly into a condition of mind such as is seen in convents, where everything unaccustomed is a terror, and the idea of an adventure, be it only to see the life of the nearest street, is like an immorality. Innovation is not so much horrible as unnatural to the true Indian temperament—there are, of course, in so vast a community, plenty of the adventurous and the impious—and innovation, if it touches his daily shrouded life, is utterly abhorrent. Upon this point Europeans, even when they know India well, are liable to fall into one natural error. They think we have already made religious, or semi-religious, semi-social innovations; but that is not the case in anything like the degree that is imagined. We have abolished suttee, have disallowed custom as an excuse for infanticide, and have prohibited one form of expiatory cruelty to one's self, the torture by swinging on a hook at religious festivals: but none of those laws really touch the people. Suttee never was practised except by specially honorable families, and its performance was a high and comparatively rare distinction, the claim to which was justifiable only in certain castes. Infanticide was a "way" of certain proud clans, and is just as obnoxious to general Hindoo feeling as to the feelings of the English poor; while the prohibition of swinging was never really resisted, because it made no difference to anybody. If a fanatic wishes to expiate the sins of a past life by self-torture, he can do it without any magistrate dreaming of interference, and do it as publicly as if he swung upon the hook. Lord Dalhousie's Act allowing the remarriage of Hindoo widows would have touched the domestic life of the people, had it been obeyed; but, as we understand the situation, it has not been obeyed, the internal machinery of Hindooism proving too strong to allow, except in the rarest instances, of such flat rebellion. We have not really affected the life of the people, and can, therefore, obtain little either of encouragement or warning from actual precedent. All Europeans know for certain is, that even in the clearest cases it is necessary to be cautious, kindly, and non-contemptuous, or the result may be a startling one. In this instance, we think the gain to humanity is worth a risk which, if the Mussulmans are as indifferent as is said, cannot involve the Empire; but it is worth while to know why Orthodox Hindoos remonstrate, and unwise to regard their remonstrances as dictated by superstition alone. They fear plenty of unreal things from the bill, but there are one or two solid objects of apprehension among them, and these should be carefully removed.

THE PREACHER AND HIS WORK.

BY DR. JOSEPH PARKER.

From *The British Weekly* (Nonconformist), London, January 8, 1891.

THE proverb says that poets are born, not made. There can be no doubt that such is the case in the instance of the true poet; the mistake is in limiting the proverb to any one characteristic of gift or genius. I hold that a shoeblack is born, and not made. It is not every cook that can boil a potato satisfactorily. We must find the sovereignty of God down in the smallest details of gift and industry, if we would be faithful to the spirit of our own religion. We are not deists; we believe in a personal providence, and a personal providence means the inspiration and the direction of the smallest issues of life. It is undoubtedly true that a preacher is born, and not made. Unless the divine fire be within him from the first, it is not in the power of colleges and tutors to kindle it. A man is either a preacher or he is not a preacher. He cannot make himself a preacher, and being a preacher he will have no desire to unmake himself.

I have never consented to the use of the word "profession" in connection with the exercise of preaching. My contention has been that preaching is a "vocation" and not a "profession." By vocation I mean that the man is distinctly and personally called of God to do a certain work in the Church. When he goes forth to do it he is simply responding to a voice which he has heard from the excellent glory. Such a man cannot be stopped in his work; can hardly ever be discouraged in his work; must always believe that on the third day he will be perfected. Fixing the mind intently upon the idea of vocation, we come at once into the fullest exercise of the only kind of authority that is worth either owning or cultivating. The authority of the true preacher is not official, it is personal. He does not acquire authority from the outside; he simply asserts with all becoming modesty, yet with unfaltering energy, the authority that is within him, created there by the power of the Holy Ghost. Men at once know whether the preacher is speaking authoritatively or only tentatively and suggestively. There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding. All weakness, hesitancy, not to say sham and hypocrisy, is instantly detected by the careful listener. When a man is called of God there will be no doubt as to his authority. It may not have much show of outward pomp, but there will be in every tone a ring or a music which indicates that the man is not speaking his own word, but the word which he has heard of the Father.

Realizing this idea of vocation, we get an answer to the oft-repeated inquiry, how to enter the ministry. In common with all my brethren, I am ever and anon requested to state how a young man may become a preacher. I hold that if God has really called a man to the office, the man will have no difficulty in discovering that he is the subject of divine vocation. In proportion to the moral nobleness of the man's impulses, and the deep conviction of the man's own soul, will he find his way into the ministry simplified and made evident by the events which constitute his daily history. From my earliest boyhood I felt that I wanted to be a minister, and that I must be a minister, or quench an aspiration within me which appeared to be beyond my own control, as its origin was certainly beyond my own will. I therefore simply entered the ministry. I did not ask any man to introduce me to it, or to tell me how to get into it, or to make my way easy; one Sunday afternoon, when I was seventeen years of age, I simply stood up on the beams of a village sawpit, and began to tell a few rustics all I knew at that time about the kingdom of God. No man sent me. No man was responsible for what I said or did. I felt a mighty impulse upon me to which I must give expression, or it would turn upon me and rend my very life. Having done this, the people asked me to go again. I went again to that village, and I went to other villages, and in this way the word of the Lord within me became more distinct and energetic, and from that day to this I have constantly endeavored to preach the everlasting Gospel, and to discover how I could make its declaration most acceptable to all my hearers. The people are the true judges of preaching. You may gold-medal a man, and certificate him, and double-first-class him up to the fullest extent of the power of all the universities in creation, but if the people do not detect in his voice a tone other than earthly, they will reject him and his gold medals, and leave him in the barren company of his ornamental certificates. I am in no way decrying erudition. On the contrary, I believe in it; I believe it is hardly possible to have too much of it. I am only pointing out that erudition by itself will never make a preacher, and that after all possible erudition has been acquired, there will still remain a subtle and inexplicable something which is necessary to turn all the materials of erudition into an acceptable service to God and man.

We are often asked in the words of the Apostle, how preachers can go unless they be sent. That question has, I think, often been misread. This is the very doctrine for which I am contending. If a man be not sent, he has no business to go. If a man go without being sent, he will come back again with empty hands and a disappointed heart. Certainly he must be sent; but sent by whom? That is the one question. The answer has always been, sent by the Church; but that is a mistake. The Church can only send whom God sends. Recall the instance of Isaiah, when he saw the Lord seated upon a throne high and lifted up, His train filling the temple; when he saw all the wondrous vision of the divine glory; when he heard a voice, whom shall I send? he answered, here am I, send me. That is precisely how the case stands from one age to another. The question is continually asked from heaven, who will go for us? Whom shall we send? Recall the injunction of the Master Himself. He said, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest that he would send forth laborers into His harvest." Observe, God is to be the sender; God is the origin; God is the fountain of inspiration and authority; it is this divine element we have forgotten. Consequently the Church has been engaging itself in searching for men, when it ought to have been praying the Lord of the harvest to find His own laborers and thrust them forth into the ripened fields.

So much for the preacher. I find in him a divine creation. The man represents not some will or whim of his own, but what he believes to be a distinct call from heaven. What, then, is the work of the preacher? The easy answer would seem to be, to preach. Poets have to write poetry. Men of science have to make discoveries. Artists have to paint and to sing. Of course, therefore, the answer to what is the work of the preacher will at once seem to be easy and to be expressed in the two words, to preach. In a certain sense, that is so. Indeed, taken rightly, in all its out-branching suggestions, it is emphatically the case. I want to insist, however, that preaching is a compound term. It is not exhausted in any one exercise or function. In the first instance, it means to proclaim, to announce, to publish, to make known to all men certain great facts and doctrines. But that is only one aspect of preaching. Of course it is the first, and carries with it no small significance and responsibility. The true preacher must be a voice crying in the wilderness and publishing certain grand and unchangeable declarations concerning God and His kingdom. But when the proclamation has been concluded the work of exposition must begin. The preacher is an expositor. He has to explain his own terms. You may suppose that he is using the very simplest terms, and that their bare enunciation will be their own exposition. This, however, is not the case. A preacher has to bear in mind that he addresses all kinds and degrees of mental culture and advancement. What is simple to one is complicated to another. He must break the bread into small pieces. He must pour the water out of the bottle gently, or none will come. He must condescend to men of low estate. Then exposition may take the other—that is to say, the upper course—and show men who suppose themselves to be scholars in the divine kingdom that they really know nothing yet, as it ought to be known. Exposition first goes down that it may find the ignorant and the simple; exposition then goes up that it may carry even the most advanced thinkers into larger light and liberty, into completer intelligence and richer joy. So the preacher is still faithful to his function, though he may not in the first sense of the term be making simply some proclamation. Exposition comes after proclamation, and both proclamation and exposition have the same end, namely, the building up of the soul in all holy things. This is called the work of edification. Stone is added to stone, and course is placed upon course, until the great temple of Christian thought is completed. Edification is itself a compound term. Of course it means in the first instance instruction; not instruction in letters and in grammar only, but instruction in the greatest doctrines, the profoundest principles, the truest philosophies of life, relationship, responsibility and destiny. We need an instructed Church. And by instruction in this sense is mainly meant deep and correct instruction in the oracles of God. We want to have a deeper and fuller acquaintance with the Bible itself. Not what is said about the Bible, but what the Bible itself says, is the one thing we should constantly aim to make clear. After instruction there will come a second branch of edification, which I may designate by the term *comfort*. The preacher is a healer; he is a physician; he has balm; he knows where the healing herbs grow.

A preacher acquires ever-increasing influence as an expositor and an instructor in proportion as he can help the broken-hearted in the day of calamity and darkness. A preacher who is without sympathy is a bird without wings. In many cases sympathy will do more than dry learning. Every congregation is made up mainly of afflicted, hopeless, careworn, anxious, broken hearts. The work of the ministry, therefore, is that which is defined in the prophet as a work of healing the diseased, comforting the mourning, taking away the garments of heaviness and replacing them with the garments of praise. Looked at in this light, there is no such work as that of the preacher. It has no rival. It can enter into competition with nothing. It simply stands in solitary grandeur; the greatest instrument in education, the fountain of comfort in the day of distress; a voice unlike all other voices in the range of its compass and the tenderness of its tone. I want young men not to be called into the ministry by zealous pastors and by ambitious churches, but I do want young men to consider whether the impulses and aspirations within them are of divine origin, and whether, by going out after commercial success, they are not really grieving the Spirit with a grieving that ends in its actual quenching. We first grieve the Spirit, then we quench Him. If these words should fall in the way of any young soul that is struggling to put down its best aspirations, let me, in a spirit of truest love and sympathy, warn that young soul that we only grieve as part of a greater process—the process which ends in the extinction of spiritual vocation and inspiration. "Quench not the Spirit." Give God guest-room in your hearts. No man hath forsaken houses or land, or brother or sister for Christ's sake, but shall receive an hundredfold more in the present life, and in the world to come life everlasting. Personally, I have made no sacrifices for Christ. I never allow myself to say that if I had been in this profession or that, I should have acquired such and such mark and influence. I humbly say that all I am and have, all I have known of competence, honor, comfort, joy, I owe to the Cross of Christ; and that I can only recognize that obligation, and not discharge it, by spending every hour of my life in the service of the Saviour of the world.

THE NEW SITUATION IN FRANCE.

From *The Catholic Review*, New York, January 18, 1891.

At last information comes that the clergy in France are going to take such part in the political affairs of the country as becomes them. Hitherto the greater number have abstained from recognizing the republic. The several pretenders to the throne have been able to count them among their supporters, without being able to give assurance that, in the event of their restoration, religion or morals would be in any degree the gainer. Meanwhile, the radicals have been doing pretty nearly as they pleased, and law after law has been forced through the Chamber and the Senate which might have been blocked were there enough Catholics of education and position in the popular branch, or writing in the popular press, or speaking on the platform, to educate public opinion against nefarious statutes.

The worst thing men can do for their country is to live strangers in it. Every citizen owes it to the government that claims his allegiance, to participate honestly and manfully in its affairs. Voluntarily to isolate himself from political duty, wilfully to avoid political responsibility, is to abdicate his own sovereignty and become a serf. Countries like Greece, in which a small minority governed brilliantly and by spasms, and the great majority were without voice in the decision of great national questions, have left sad chapters in history to warn against a silent citizenship. The country is best off in which liberty is brought down to the greatest number of the people, and in which, in turn, the greatest number exercise calmly, conscientiously, and habitually the prerogatives of freemen. The Republic of France is no longer an experiment. It is stable so far as human foresight can predict. It has defied many dangers, and survived crises that would have destroyed its foundations were they not deep and strong. All its sons should take part in its conduct, and by contributing each his part to the aggregate wisdom, seek to steer it aright.

It has been the fashion to sneer at the republic of France as godless, as anarchistic, as communistic, as tottering, as this and that and the other thing. The British press has assiduously kept up the assurance that although the republic survived the peril of yesterday, it will inevitably crumble beneath the menace of to-morrow. To-morrow has come and gone many times, and still the people of France are quietly attending to their affairs, carrying on the most diversified industries the world has ever known, keeping the lead in fine arts and in the arts of design in general, competing with the Germans in physical science and with the English in shrewd investment of capital ; opening new opportunities to chemistry and machinery in textiles, and to the farmer in trade ; and meanwhile to Paris flock the students of all the world for chance to get in its ateliers the instruction not to be had anywhere else in the world. Throughout the country industry is alert, commerce active, tranquillity universal. The republic is peace.

There is no good reason why any class of its people shall abstain from share in its direction. The government is the people's. To be sure there are still romantic and loyal spirits who cling to thrones and crowns, to sceptres and courts, to the tradition of divine right, and detest the vulgarity, if not the danger, of democracy. But this is a practical world. For such idealists little room is left in it outside of Russia. The young German Kaiser must seem to these worshippers of monarchs a model after the pattern of Frederick the Great or Charlemagne—a long way after. There is room in France for even these. They know that if their country has discarded royalty, it still possesses children. For these provisions must be made. For these there is a future though there be none—ay, let us hope there shall be none—for kings or emperors in France. Government belongs to the governed. France has tried every form and comes back to the republic, chastened, frugal, hopeful, self-sacrificing. Her children must be educated. Their characters must be formed. Upon what patterns?

If the Conservatives adhere to their non-participation programme, they betray the youth of France to what they believe to be the worst foe of their generation—infidelity. Whatever faults Paris may have, the great mass of the French people are true to Catholic ideals, and prefer to retain old standards of piety and pure domestic love, rather than alter them to new fangled boulevard pretensions of infallibility. For the sake of the youth of France, then, monarchists should abate their scorn of democracy and take up the duties of patriots. The republic is stable. It will become precisely what the majority of those who manage its destiny shall make it. If radicalism is to have every thing its own way, Conservatives are to blame. It is no dishonor to a man, whatever his ancestry, however aristocratic his family tree, or his own tastes, to take part in the direction of his country's affairs. He is a coward, a doctrinaire, a crank, for isolating himself from the ballot-box, from the chamber, from the senate, from the press, from the rostrum.

It is good news that many of the clergy are coming back to their proper place among the French people ; and that conservative Catholics are dropping cobwebbed legends of impossible restorations for open and manly activity in the politics of their country.

THE LIBRARIES OF ROME.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.

From *The Interior* (Presbyterian), Chicago, January 1, 1891.
Revised by Dr. Schaff for this MAGAZINE.

ROME is the best place to study history, for it is the graveyard of history. Gibbon was inspired to his great work on the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," at the feet of the broad steps which lead to Capitol Hill. Niebuhr, the historian of old Rome, received a similar impulse on the classical spot. Rome was the mistress of the civilized world for two thousand years, first ruling by the sword, then by the cross. Her influence upon the course of events is beyond calculation. Even now the aged, unmarried priest, who calls himself a prisoner in the Vatican, rules the best organized army of priests and monks in five continents, and issues his infallible decrees to 200,000,000 of Catholics, who regard him as the vicar of Christ and the vicegerent of God on earth.

The study of history is aided in Rome, as nowhere else, by monuments, churches, museums and picture galleries, which illustrate books. How eloquent are the ruins of the Colosseum, the Baths of Caracalla, the Forum, the Palatine Hill, and the Via Appia for the study of heathen Rome under the sway of the Cæsars! An excursion to Tusculum, Tivoli, and the villa of Hadrian—how vividly it brings before you Cicero, Horace, and the emperor who gathered all the glories and comforts of his age around him!

The two chief apostles spent their last days in Rome, and consecrated her soil with their martyr blood, which is the seed of the church. The Catacombs introduce you into the humble, lowly, devout and hopeful life of the Christians in the days of persecution. A visit to "Roma Sotterranea" is worth the study of dozens of volumes on ancient Christianity. And, further on, throughout the whole of the Middle Ages down to the Reformation, and even beyond it, to the close of the papal counter-Reformation, Rome furnishes the richest material, written and unwritten, for the ecclesiastical and political history of Europe. For the popes guided the Christianization and civilization of the northern and western barbarians, sent Augustin with thirty Benedictines to England, Boniface to Germany, Ansgar to Scandinavia, crowned Charlemagne and his successors, stood in correspondence with all the sovereigns, received reports through their legates from every court, and exerted more influence and power over the destinies of the world at large, than any king or emperor in his own dominion. Nowhere is it possible, except perhaps in Florence, to study the Renaissance and revival of learning to better advantage than in Rome, where you can see with your own eyes the masterpieces of those great poets, architects, sculptors, and painters, who made the Renaissance one of the most interesting chapters in history.

But while Rome is richest in monuments and works of art, she is also rich in libraries. In printed books, especially of modern date, her libraries are behind those of Paris, Vienna, Munich, Berlin and the British Museum in London ; but in manuscripts dating from the fourth to the sixteenth century she is ahead of them all and will continue to be. For her manuscripts contain the most valuable documents of Oriental, Greek and Roman, and mediæval literature, down to the invention of the printing-press. They may be copied, like statues and pictures, but the originals cannot be bought for any price. You have to resort to Rome for the best codices of the Greek Testament and Septuagint, of Homer, Virgil, Cicero, Lactantius, Augustin, Dante and the great heathen and Christian classics. Some are most handsomely written, richly illustrated, and luxuriously bound with gold and silver clasps.

First in age and importance is the Vatican Library in the Vatican Palace. It was founded more than 400 years ago by Pope Nicholas V., who occupied the chair of St. Peter for seven years, 1447–1455, a few years before and after the invention of the art of printing in Germany. Nicholas was one of the best and most useful of popes. He was not an author himself, but a friend of authors, and the most liberal patron of learning and art among the 250 successors of the illiterate fisherman of Galilee. He was willing to spend all his income for books and buildings. He cared more for scholars and architects than for monks and theologians. He gave them employment as transcribers, translators and papal secretaries, and paid them liberal salaries. He made Rome the literary center of Christendom. He sent agents to all parts of Italy and other countries, even as far north as Prussia, to buy rare books. He had them copied on parchment and richly bound in Russia leather. He collected the works of Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, Aristotle, Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Appian, Philo Judæus, the Latin classics, the Greek and Latin church fathers, and probably also the invaluable Codex Vaticanus of the Greek Bible—the oldest and most important of all manuscripts of the Scriptures. He kindled a feverish enthusiasm for the translation of Greek authors among the best scholars. He paid 500 scudi to Laurentius Valla for a Latin version of Thucydides ; 500 new papal ducats to Nicholas Perotti, for a translation of Polybius ; and offered 1,000 gold pieces for a translation of Homer. In the case of Homer, however, he was disappointed, for Marsuppini translated only two books of the Iliad, and Valla the first sixteen books in prose. His reign was a jubilee for the humanists, who were as enthusiastic for the discovery of classical manuscripts, as modern Egyptologists and Assyriologists are for the discovery of hieroglyphics and Babylonian bricks.

Nicholas collected 9,000 written volumes, and these are the foundation of the Vatican Library. He intended it for the common use of all scholars ("*pro communi doctorum virorum commodo*")—an intention which was not carried out by his successors, till the year 1880, when the present scholarly Pope, Leo XIII., introduced a more liberal policy and made those treasures accessible to scholars of all nations. To this Pope we also owe the one hundred fac-simile copies of the Vatican Codes of the Greek Testament, which he allowed to be photographed last year.

The Vatican Library has been gradually enriched from time to time by donations and purchases, and embraces now over 32,000 manuscripts which were written prior to the art of printing, and are kept in closed cases behind iron grates; and about 100,000 bound volumes, which are distributed in the various rooms of the Borgia apartments. As a daily visitor for several weeks, I can bear testimony to the courtesy of the chief librarian, who gave me all the books I asked for, and allowed me to examine the Codex Vaticanus to my heart's content.

Distinct from the Vatican Library, and under separate management, are the Vatican Archives (*Archivio Secreto della santa sede*), which are kept in a different part of the Vatican and are more difficult of access; it being necessary to get special permission from the Pope or from the cardinal librarian (Dr. Hergenröther) on written application. These archives contain the papal correspondence, encyclicals, regesta, and other documents relating to the curia. The bishops of Rome kept a library and archive from the time of Damasus or earlier. The first mention of them is made by Jerome, in the fourth century. But the repeated sieges and destructions of Rome were disastrous to books. There are no earlier written documents extant than one from Gregory VII., two from John VIII., and these are mere copies. From the time of Innocent III., A.D. 1198, the papal regesta are unbroken. The use of this immense collection of quarto and folio volumes of MSS. is difficult from want of proper catalogues. There is, however, a little Latin manual of a list of papal regesta from 1198–1605, prepared by D. Greg. Palmieri, one of the sub-archivarians, printed at Rome in 1884 (xxviii. and 175 pages). I found it very useful as far as it goes.

We have not space to do more than mention some other important libraries of Rome. The largest in printed works is the National Library of Victor Emanuel, in the Collegio Romano near the Corso. It has over 400,000 volumes collected from various convents, and is liberally administered by the royal government. In connection with it is a reading-room, where the most important periodicals (except theological) are kept. The Library of the church of Santa Maria Sopra Minerva, near the Pantheon, is very rich in patristic and mediæval literature, and now likewise under government control. The Library of the German Archæological Institute, in the Casa Tarpeia on the Capitol Hill, was founded by Niebuhr and Bunsen, Prussian ambassadors, and formerly belonged to Prussia, but now to the German Empire. It has about 32,000 volumes, is exceedingly useful for classical, archæological and artistic studies, and most liberally administered. It is a delight to study in the rooms of the institute, on the hill which for so many centuries was the center of the world.

CARDINAL NEWMAN, LEO XIII., AND LOUVAIN.

BY ST. GEORGE MIVART.

[From *The Paternoster Review*, February, 1891.

THE wave of generous and elevated emotion which was raised by the death of Cardinal Newman, has not yet arrested its course. The deep feeling which permeated almost all classes and creeds amongst us, still powerfully affects very many hearts and minds. His influence will indeed last as long as this planet remains tenanted by mankind; for, wherever the English tongue and English modes of thought extend, that influence must be felt; and De Candolle tells us the English tongue is to be the most widespread and influential of all. And if in some far-off future, which no man can yet foresee, the present cultured races of Europe should have to give place to other tribes of mankind, it is impossible but that such men of the future should be influenced by their predecessors, as the barbarians who invaded the Roman Empire were influenced by the civilisation they dominated, largely destroyed, but more transformed. Thus the transmission of every profound influence must be to some extent handed on, and the influence of Cardinal Newman we believe to be profound.

One of the most noteworthy portions of his teaching is that concerning the essential needs and characteristics of a UNIVERSITY.

It was in 1852 that he published his "Discourses on the Scope and Nature of University Education," wherein he showed so remarkable a prescience as to some tendencies then more or less obscure, but which have since become very plainly manifest.

One object of his work was to make it evident that no science — and certainly neither Philosophy nor Theology—should be excluded from any institution whose very title of "University" proclaims it to be a seat of universal knowledge. Is it "philosophical or possible,"* he asks, "to profess all branches of knowledge, yet to exclude one, and that one not the lowest in the series?"

As to Theology, he expresses himself † thus: "If in an institution which professes all knowledge, nothing is professed, nothing is taught about the Supreme Being, it is fair to infer that every individual of all those who advocate that Institution—supposing him consistent—distinctly holds that nothing is known for certain about the Supreme Being; nothing such as to have any claim to be regarded as an accession to the stock of general knowledge existing in the world. If on the other hand it turns out that something considerable is known about the Supreme Being, whether from reason or revelation, then the institution in question professes every science, and leaves out the foremost of them. In a word, strong as may appear the assertion, I do not see how I can avoid making it: such an institution cannot be what it professes, if there is a God. I do not wish to declaim, but, by the very force of the terms, it is very plain, that God and such a university cannot co-exist.''

---

* P. 39.

† P. 43.

The truth of this is manifest. It is unquestionable that to erect or maintain educational institutions from which theology is excluded is to deny religion, unless religion is a matter external to the intellect. Accordingly, the Cardinal next calls attention to the fact that Lutheranism and Evangelican religion had, even when he wrote, made this strange delusion a popular one, saying * :—"The religious world, as it is styled, holds, generally speaking, that religion consists, not in knowledge, but in feeling or sentiment. . . . Not, as a Catholic would say, in a straightforward acceptance of revealed truth and an acting upon it, but in a dreamy and sickly state of soul; in an effort after religious conversation; in a constrained gravity of demeanour, and an unnatural tone of voice." He then refers to the minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, wherein one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools had expressly declared that "the inculcation of sentiment" embraced poetry and music, together with "moral and religious education." What, then asks † Cardinal Newman, can more clearly prove that in the eyes of such men "religion is not knowledge, has nothing whatever to do with knowledge, and is excluded from a University course of instruction; not simply because the exclusion cannot be helped, from political or social obstacles, but because it has no business there at all; because it is to be considered a mere taste, sentiment, opinion, and nothing more? . . . Here is Lutheranism sublimated into philosophy.''

But this result shows us another very interesting fact, namely, how Agnosticism is latent in much Lutheranism and Evangelicanism. If religion is really a matter not of the intellect and will, but of the feelings, the Being of God must then be for us, a matter not of knowledge but emotion; and so piety and Agnosticism kiss one another. Consequently, a positive denial of the possibility of our obtaining absolute knowledge that a God exists need be no detriment to true religion. Thus the very founder of Agnosticism has, amongst other utterances of a similar character, declared * that "the engagement of the affections in favour of that particular kind of conduct we call good . . . together with awe and reverence, which have no kinship with base fear, but arise whenever one tries to pierce below the surface of things, whether they be material or spiritual, constitutes all that has any unchangeable reality in religion." That eminent rhetorician, Professor Tyndall, has also remarked,† with respect to existing forms of religion:—"It will be wise to recognise them as the forms of a force, mischievous if permitted to intrude on the region of objective knowledge, over which it holds no command, but capable of adding, in the region of poetry and emotion, inward completeness and dignity to man."

But what can that religion really be which influential Agnostics thus favour? We are convinced that religion is and must be an affair of reason and conduct, and consists of certain very definite propositions (or dogmas), the acceptance of which should regulate action, just as a knowledge of the laws concerning physics and navigation should regulate the conduct of the ship's captain. Whether the captain is or is not an emotional man can be of little consequence so long as he guides his ship rationally according to the laws referred to; and, similarly, whether a man with respect to his religion be glowing and emotional, or cold and dry, seems to me of little consequence so long as he guides his conduct rationally, according to the dictates of religion. Let us imagine a man who believes in a Holy God, and who throughout his life is scrupulous in performing his public and private worship, and acts with justice and goodwill to his fellows. Let us suppose him to be devoid of pious emotion, and to feel but little pleasure in the various good deeds he performs, but which are none the less punctually performed. I do not suppose that either of the writers last quoted would deny that such a man was a "religious" man.

---

* P. 47.

† P. 53.

* See Professor Huxley's "Critiques and Addresses," p. 48.

† See his Belfast address, p. 61.

Now, not a few such religious men do in fact exist, while every one who has any extensive knowledge of Catholic teaching knows well enough that nothing is more common than for priestly directors to warn those who seek their counsel against the ensnaring perils of "pious emotion."

This initial contention of Cardinal Newman against a popular error seems to us so extremely important, while the error it combats is so inveterate, that we think it well to analyse the question somewhat more before turning to any other matter.

In the first place "What is emotion?" It is a pleasurable or painful affection accompanying either (1) something felt (actually, or in imagination), or (2) something thought. But no one would term a mere feeling, or a feeling accompanied by thoughts in no way elevated, a "religious emotion." Every one would admit that they must be feelings accompanying ideas of a high order. Let us then consider some such ideas, selecting only such as do not explicitly concern God, and try the experiment of maintaining them apart from dogma. Let us consider Professor Huxley's "religious emotion" respecting good conduct, together with "awe and reverence." To these we will venture to add "feelings of admiration for things beautiful or true." Now any deliberate and conscious indulgence in admiration for a good act implies two judgments: (1) there is such a thing as virtue, and (2) virtue is admirable. These are two very distinct "dogmas," and they include and imply a third, namely (3), "There is an objective standard of virtue which does not depend upon taste." This objective standard cannot be the opinion of the community of which we may form a portion. For our reason tells us, in the first place, that we ought in certain cases to act in opposition to such opinion. Neither can "goodness" ever be identified * with "utility."

Therefore admiration for "good conduct" really and necessarily implies the existence of an objective "not ourselves," which has somehow given rise to the subjective categorical imperative.

In the same way, an admiration for beauty and truth imply objective standards.†

As to "awe" and "reverence," to have such feelings for a volcano, a whirlwind, or the rising sun, may be expected of a savage, because he may, more or less distinctly, reverence and fear in such phenomena some mysterious superhuman personality. But only let a man be thoroughly convinced that these phenomena are simply and solely physical, that they are not the manifestations of a higher intelligence than his own, and then, whatever might be his feelings about them, he could no longer entertain any real "reverence" for them.

But if true religious emotion thus depends upon the exercise of the intellect, does emotion form any necessary part in religion at all? As already said, Catholic teaching is far from affirming anything of the kind. Admirable and excellent as an occasional help towards good conduct, it is never to be sought as an end or deemed meritorious.

No doubt a perfect man would be rich in good feelings, as well as in good desires and actions; but a full development in all directions is necessarily rare, and a corporative atrophy of emotion is immeasurably preferable to any defect of good will. There are saintly men who have gone on persevering in virtue for years, uncheered by a gleam of religious emotion, their merit being increased by their path being thus rendered more arduous. On the other hand it is only too certain that "pious emotion" may be frequently enjoyed by persons whose actions by no means harmonise therewith.

We should be very sorry to be understood as expressing any disesteem for our higher emotions, or for the religious emotions of men who do not profess themselves Theists. On the contrary, we would wish such emotions to be fostered, however irrationally held, because we think it likely they may serve as a means of revealing to those who have them, truths of which they may not be at present conscious. Nevertheless to talk of religious emotion continuing to exist independently of religious convictions is to talk mere nonsense and unmeaning verbiage, and thus the religion of emotion can be but an inane nervous tremour—the religion of folly.

Religious emotion needs then for its support an express or implicit assent to certain very definite propositions, which when analysed will be found to contain a whole theology latent within them. If therefore, all persons--Agnostics as well as others—thus agree in desiring that religious sentiment should continue to exist, it follows that they are really, however unconsciously, the advocates of a definite theological teaching of one kind or another, and practically affirm that there can be no complete system of higher education from which such teaching is eliminated. At the very least mere natural theology teaches the existence of a self-conscious personal Deity, the source of all

---

* As to this see "On Truths," pp. 244-251.

† See *Op. cit.*, pp. 257 and 238

wisdom, truth, goodness, beauty and love, who is omnipotent and omniscient; to worship whom is the highest privilege of a rational creature, and to whom every one of us has to render a strict account for every action, word and deliberate thought, according as it accords or not with that perception of right and duty which He has implanted in every sane mind according to the degree of its development. If such be the necessary intellectual formation of every merely natural religious emotion, it is unnecessary here to insist on the consequences of admiting the fact of a Revelation.

But Cardinal Newman further pointed out, with great perspicacity, the indirect effects on other sciences which an exclusion of theology tends to bring about. Science considered in its totality being a representation of the totality of existence, the various different sciences are, as he says,* "the results of mental processes about one and the same subject matter, viewed under various aspects, and are true results as far as they go, yet at the same time independent and partial. It follows that on the one hand they need external assistance one by one by reason of their incompleteness, and on the other that they are able to afford it to each other by reason, first, of their distinctness in themselves, and then of their identity in their subject matter. Viewed all together, they become the nearest approximation to a representation or subjective reflexion of the objective truth possible to the human mind, which advances towards the accurate apprehension of that object in proportion to the number of sciences it has mastered; and which, when certain sciences are wanting, in such case has but a defective apprehension in proportion to the value of the sciences which are thus wanting, and the importance of the field on which they are employed."

The natural results of the exclusion of any of the sciences is to deform those adjacent to it through the exaggeration which is then apt to be given to them in order that the vacant space which such an exclusion produces in our knowledge may be filled up. Men are notoriously apt to apply the standards and methods of comparison which are the proper methods of the sciences, with which they are familiar, to matters that have not been studied by them, and to which such standards are not appropriate. It is ever the old prejudice, "There is nothing like leather!" The Cardinal cites † an amusing illustration of this error from the inaugural lecture of the first Professor of Political Economy at Oxford. The Professor affirmed "that the pursuit of wealth—that is, the endeavour to accumulate the means of future subsistence and enjoyment—is to the mass of mankind the great source of *moral* improvement."

As to this statement Cardinal Newman observes: "It is just so far true, as to be able to instill what is false, far as the author was from any such design. I grant this, beggary is not the means of moral improvement; and that the orderly habits which attend upon the hot pursuit of gain, not only may affect an external decency, but may at least shelter the soul from the temptations of vice. Moreover, these habits of good order guarantee regularity in a family or household, and thus are accidentally the means of good to those who come under their protection by leading to their education, and thus accidentally providing the rising generation with a virtue or a truth which the present has not; but without going into these considerations, further than to allow them generally, and under circumstances, let us rather contemplate what the author's direct assertion is. 'The endeavour to *accumulate*,' the words should be weighed, and for what? for *enjoyment*;—'to accumulate the means of future subsistence and enjoyment, is to the mass of mankind, the *great* source; not merely *a* source, but *the great source*, and of what? of social and political progress? Such an answer would have been more within the limits of his art,—no, but of something individual and personal, 'of *moral improvement*.' The soul, as regards the mass of mankind, improves in moral excellence from this more than from anything else, viz., from keeping up the means of enjoying the world in time to come! . . . One is indeed taken by surprise on meeting with so very categorical a contradiction of Our Lord, St. Paul, St. Chrysostom, St. Leo, and all the Saints."

That Cardinal Newman should have thus contended for the universality of University Education and against the exclusion of Theology, is only—it may be said—what might have been expected from him under the conditions and circumstances which were his at the time he published the work we are quoting. Nevertheless his contention is one singularly well supported and sustained, nor has one of his arguments lost validity since he first put it forth.

There is, however, another position unequivocally assumed by him, which to some persons was, and may still be, a surprise. Dr. Newman (as was then his title) was a priest; he had been in an ecclesiastical position from his earliest manhood, while he was never prominent as a metaphysician or known to have made any special study of philosophy. Nevertheless, he did not hesitate to contend that the essence of a University education is that it should be so conducted and arranged as to constitute one philosophical system; and not only this, but that every science—theology no less than the others—should be recognised as subordinate to the science of sciences, that is, philosophy. True philosophy should dominate always and everywhere, and so make the University not a mere abiding place for the independent inculcation of different kinds of knowledge, but a source of universal knowledge in the form of one representation of the whole objective universe in all its relations in so far as that universe is accessible to the mind of man.

---

* P. 72.

† P. 127.

The Cardinal illustrates his meaning as to philosophy, by pointing out the necessary characteristics of each subordinate science. "A science," he truly says,* "is not mere knowledge, it is knowledge which has undergone a process of intellectual digestion. It is the group of many things brought together in one, and hence is its power; for, properly speaking, it is science that is power, not knowledge. Well then, this is how" he declares we should "act towards the Sciences taken all together." . . . "Imagine a science of sciences, and you have attained the true notion of the scope of a University. We consider that all things mount up to a whole, that there is an order and precedence and harmony in the branches of knowledge one with another, as well as one by one; and that to destroy that structure is as unphilosophical in a course of education as it is unscientific in the separate portions of it. We form and fix the sciences in a circle and system, and give them a centre and an aim, instead of letting them wander up and down in a sort of hopeless confusion. In other words, to use scholastic language, we give the various pursuits and objects on which the intellect is employed, a form; for it is the peculiarity of a form, that it gathers up in one, and draws off from everything else, the materials on which it is impressed."

This conception of a University is indeed the very antithesis of that vulgar, but still too popular notion which regards it as a sort of bazaar at each of the various stalls of which a different professor dispenses the intellectual wares in which he quite independently deals. Such an educational institution can have no advantage save the merely material one of the close juxtaposition of different places of study and tuition.

And it is philosophy and no single science, not even that of theology, which must necessarily dominate, harmonize, and verify the teaching of whatever Institution can justly claim the noble title of a University. Cardinal Newman has most distinctly and emphatically recognised this fundamental truth. With unmistakeable clearness he declares:* "Far indeed am I from having intended to convey the notion, in the illustrations I have been using, that theology stands to other knowledge as the soul to the body; or that other sciences are but its instruments and appendages, just as the whole ceremonial of worship is but the expression of inward devotion. This would be, I conceive, to commit the very error, in the instance of Theology, which I am charging other sciences, at the present day, of committing against it. On the contrary, theology is one branch of knowledge, and secular sciences are other branches. Theology is the highest indeed, and widest, but it does not interfere with the real freedom of any secular science in its own department. . . . Not science only, not literature only, not theology only, neither abstract knowledge simply nor experimental, neither moral nor material, neither metaphysical nor historical, but all knowledge whatever is taken into account in a University, as being the special seat of that large philosophy which embraces and locates truth of every kind, and every method of attaining it."

But there is yet one more aspect of University teaching treated of by Cardinal Newman, to which we desire to specially direct the attention of our readers. It is the end and aim of such teaching. It concerns the question, should its one object be to impart knowledge in such a way and only to such an extent as may best aid students in their subsequent various careers in life; or should it be to impart knowledge for its own sake, and to carry its teaching to the very highest point it can possibly attain?

To this question he replies:† "I am prepared to maintain that philosophy is its own end; that there is a knowledge worth possessing for what it is, and not merely for what it does." He compares‡ intellectual perfection with bodily health thus: "Health is good in itself, though nothing come of it, and is especially worth seeking and cherishing; yet, after all, the blessings which attend its presence are so great that we never think of it except as useful as well as good, and praise and prize it for what it does, as well as for what it is, though at the same time we cannot point out any definite and distinct work or production which it can be said to affect. And so as regards intellectual culture. I am far from denying utility in this large sense as the end of education, when I lay it down that the culture of the intellect in itself is its own end; I do not exclude from the idea of intellectual culture what it cannot but be from the very nature of things, I only deny that we must be able to point out, before we have any right to call it useful, some art, or business, or profession, or trade, or thing, as resulting from it, and as its real and complete end." . . . "Again, as health ought to precede labour of the body, and as a man in health can do what an unhealthy man cannot do, and as of this health the perfections are vigour, energy, agility, graceful carriage and action, manual dexterity, and endurance of fatigue, so in like manner general culture of mind is the best aid to professional and scientific study, and educated men can do what illiterate cannot; and the man who has learned to think, and to reason, and to compare, and to discriminate, and to analyse, who has refined his taste and formed his judgment, and sharpened his mental vision, will not indeed at once be a lawyer, or a pleader, or an actor, or a statesman, or a physician, or a good landlord, or a man of business, or a soldier, or an engineer, or a chemist, or a geologist, or an antiquarian, but he will be placed in that state of intellect in which he can take up any one of the sciences or callings I have referred to, or any other, with an ease and grace, and versatility, and a success to which another is a stranger."

---

* P. 144.

* P. 152. † P. 188. ‡ P. 254.

He concludes* as follows:—"If, then, a practical end must be assigned to a University course, I say it is that of training good members of society. Its art is the art of social life, and its end is fitness for the world. It does not confine its views to particular professions. . . . A University training is the great ordinary means to a great but ordinary end; it aims at raising the intellectual tone of society, at cultivating the public mind, at purifying the national taste, at supplying true principles to popular enthusiasm and fixed ones to popular aspiration, at giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age, at facilitating the exercise of political power, and refining the intercourse of private life. It is the education which gives a man a clear conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them, and a force in urging them. It teaches him to see things as they are, to go right to the point, to disentangle a skein of thought, to select what is sophistical, and to discard what is irrelevant. It prepares him to fill any post with credit, and to master any subject with facility. It shows him how to accommodate himself to others, how to throw himself into their state of mind, how to bring before them his own, how to influence them, how to come to an understanding with them, how to bear with them. He is at home in any society, he has common ground with every class; he knows when to speak and when to be silent; he is able to converse, he is able to listen; he can ask a question pertinently, and gain a lesson seasonably, when he has nothing to impart himself; he is ever ready, yet never in the way; he is a pleasant companion, and a comrade you can depend upon; he knows when to be serious and when to trifle, and he has a sure tact which enables him to trifle with gracefulness and to be serious with effect. He has the repose of a mind which lives in itself while it lives in the world, and which has resources for its happiness at home when it cannot go abroad. He has a gift which serves him in public and supports him in retirement, with which good fortune is but vulgar, and with which failure and disappointment have a charm. The art which tends to make a man all this is in its idea as useful as the art of wealth or the art of health."

There are thus three points with respect to University education upon which Cardinal Newman insists. They are: (1) No science must be excluded, and certainly not theology; (2) true philosophy should dominate and unify in one system its whole means of education; and (3) the end and aim of that education should not be professional knowledge, but culture for its own sake, and to the highest degree attainable.

It may interest the many admirers of the late Cardinal, and those who view with favour what he most desired, to learn that the spirit which has animated Leo XIII. in his recent action with respect to the venerable University of Louvain is the very same spirit as that manifested in the quotations which have here been given from the writings of our illustrious fellow-countryman. The Head of the Church has shown himself to have specially at heart those very objects which were deemed as essential by the Cardinal.

---

* P. 285.

Of course with respect to the first point nothing remained to be done, theology forming a distinct Faculty at Louvain, as is natural in a Catholic University. And here we may perhaps be permitted to state our conviction that no institution which is not a Catholic one, can perfectly fulfil the functions of a University.

This assertion is made quite apart from the question whether or not the Catholic religion is true. It is based simply on a knowledge of the breadth of Catholic theology, and of the fact that no "broad church" is so "broad" as is the teaching of Rome. This enables Catholic theology to embrace and locate every religious system from that of the Greek Church, through every form of Christianity, Judaism, Mahometanism, and Paganism, down to the fetish worship of Western Africa. True or false, Catholicism forms a vast, harmoniously organised whole, whereof every other religious system may be adequately represented as a more or less considerable or insignificant fragment. We do not believe it possible that the same can be truly affirmed of any other system whatever, and if so, then the merely intellectual outlook of every other theology must be maimed and incomplete.

Neither was any effort needed at Louvain to rescue from oblivion any of the sciences, since none were excluded from the teaching of that University in its several faculties; but the Pope has desired, and has manifested the desire for several years, to encourage and promote philosophy and science at Louvain in a special manner. As the Rector, Monseigneur Abbeloos, stated in his opening address last October: "Le grand Pape qui des hauteurs du Vatican domine le monde des intelligences nous a depuis longtemps montré combien Il sait allier à d'innombrables soins de tout genre le souci des intérêts élevés de la science. Il y a huit ans déjà qu' Il daigna confier à la sollicitude de l'Épiscopat belge la mission de fonder à Louvain un cours spécial de philosophie. Ce cours a prospéré. Hautement satisfait du succès atteint le Saint-Pere a jugé le moment venu de compléter son œuvre en ajoutant à l'enseignement philosophique proprement dit des cours de sciences et de linguistique. Non content, vous le savez, d'imprimer aux hautes études cette impulsion souveraine, Sa Sainteté a voulu contribuer à leur organisation par la plus noble générosité personnelle; il m'est doux de renouveler ici publiquement l'hommage de la gratitude profonde que nous inspire à tous cette preuvre de magnanime et paternelle bienveillance."

Briefly then, the great desire of Leo XIII. is that the teaching of Louvain should be permeated with philosophy, and it is Monseigneur Mercier, D.D., Ph.D., and Canon of Malines, who has been placed at the head of the new educational development which the Pope has initiated, and, in fact, founded. In his inaugural address he pointed out how and why it is that now, especially, "les sciences particulières appellent une synthese supérieure, une science des sciences, celle que l'on appelle la philosophie." The Pontiff's next desire is that the teaching of the sciences should be further advanced, not in the direction of professional studies, but, as Cardinal Newman has so admirably expressed, for the perfecting of the whole manhood of each student, and the benefit of whatever nation such student is to be a citizen. The new departure then is the energetic pronouncement in favour of the teaching of science for its own sake (as distinct from the narrow ends of professional advantage) and the harmonizing and organizing of all science by a thorough incalculation of true philosophy. Thus Monseigneur Mercier further observed: "L'enseignement professionnel a souvent l'observation des faits pour but final, tandis que, pour nous, les faits ne sont et ne peuvent être qu'un moyen, un point de départ vers la connaisance plus générale des causes et des lois."

As instances of the practical outcome which Louvain may be expected to show us from the combined action of its original and its fully developed teaching, we may refer to three lines of controversy which have lately, do now, and soon will, widely occupy men's minds. The first of these concerns Biology, which has of late become so specially studied with respect to questions of Embryology. For this the University can boast, in addition to the veteran Van Beneden, the aid of Professor Carnoy, of European reputation, ably seconded by Professor Gilson, who daily comes from the ancient Premonstratation Abbey of Parc, to study and to teach facts as to the "extrusion of Polar vesicles," and other details of the most advanced science. The second line of controversy concerns "Biblical Criticism," and "the Natural History of Religions," and here we find the everywhere esteemed Monseigneur de Harlez; a man whose breadth of view and thorough competence are as well known as his orthodoxy. Professor Colinet follows in his footsteps. Not less well treated will be the third matter of controversy, which concerns the various problems of the history of the Christian Church during the first three centuries, a subject taught by Professor Jungmann, Canon of Bruges, and the author of various learned works, and in this connexion we may mention the Rev. J. F. Van der Stappen, Canon of Malines, and Professor at its great Seminary. Such a knowledge of matters liturgical as he possesses will not easily be matched elsewhere.

However, the greatest and most important of all the activities thus promoted at Louvain, is the new impulse given to the study of philosophy. It is, as we have just seen, but a continuation of the Papal action of eight years ago, and of the bull, urging its promotion on the whole Christian Episcopate. It is also especially interesting to us, and we are sure to very many other Englishmen, to find the views and efforts of our own Cardinal thus supported and reinforced by the authoritative voice of that great Pontiff, whose act it was to raise the former preacher of St. Mary's, Oxford, to sit amongst the princes of the Church, and so become an authoritative teacher, as well as an example, not for his own countrymen only, but for the whole Christian Church.

THE SANCTITY OF THE BODY.

BY THE BISHOP OF RIPON.

From *The Sunday Magazine*, February, 1891.

> "Then those men, when they had seen the miracle that Jesus did, said, This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world."—JOHN vi. 14.

THERE are two classes of character in the world, the character of those who are called practical people and the character of those who are described, with the slightest hint of a sneer, as visionaries, and it often occurs to us in watching their work, to wonder whether the true and ideal character is not a combination of both of these. Can we afford to do without the practical man in the world? Is not his sound judgment just a power which is needed in life; and on the other hand, can we afford to do without those who, with a little touch of scorn, we call the visionaries? Is the poetic element of a life to be excluded? Are we never to allow a gleam of romance in life? We may venture to believe that the ideal character requires the combination of both elements. We are not to be bound by the commonplace of life, and we can never read truth aright, save in the light of the unseen and eternal life. And yet though we may admit that the best character is that which combines the ideal and poetic force with the power of strict dealing with facts; yet the man of good sound sense will look askance at the visionary, and the poetical mind will look with scorn on him who can only deal with things seen and tangible.

Jesus Christ came into the world to set right our conceptions of life. When we look at this narrative it seems as if it touched practical and poetical sides of life. There is a materialism yet which is not a mere materialism. This has not always been remembered.

(I.) There is a duty to the bodies of men. The Church exists in the world as a witness of the unseen; and the Church, feeling that its duty was to bear witness to the unseen, was at times disposed to disregard the things seen, and to treat them as hardly worthy of consideration. And so the bodies of men came to be looked on as clogs and hindrances to a spiritual life. The neglect of the body became a sort of creed. There arose the idea that the spiritual had no need of the natural. It was even thought that by neglecting what God had created it would be possible to climb into His presence. But our Lord brings before us His protest against this conception. The bodies of men are precious in His sight. The idea of the disciples was to cast off the responsibility of providing for the multitude. "Send them away to the villages to buy food." "They need not depart!" is our Lord's reply; "Give ye them to eat." It is as though He said, "We have accepted their homage, and we have told them concerning the Divine Father who cares for all. Are we to send them to the villages to faint by the way? Are we to show that we have so little care for them as to cause them to jeopardise health and life? We accept the responsibility." And the Church must accept the responsibility of duty towards the body. That was recognised in the better days of the Church's history. Wherever she moved, she learned to care for the bodily life of men. It grew out of Christ's life; He showed that He cared for the bodies of men. Was there want of physical health? He will restore it. Is there pain? He will alleviate it. Whenever there is need, He will supply it. "They need not depart." Those hungry multitudes, and those weak frames of men, who gather round Him, need not depart; for the hand of Heaven is stretched out to relieve their wants. And reasonably so, if we reflect upon it; for form is the vehicle of expression of the spirit. It is essential then that the body should be cared for. Just as words are valuable to the orator to express his thoughts, so also are our bodies to give expression to the thoughts and truths of inner life. God has made material things for a set purpose. Our bodies are to manifest life and the light which is within. If the grand idea of human life is that we are to show true, pure, heaven-born love to one another, then this bodily fabric we possess is precious as the instrument of activity and kindness. The maintenance of health and strength are duties, for when we employ the vehicle which is to give expression to the thoughts of God, can we allow it to be weakened by neglect of it, and rendered incapable of exercising its proper functions and duties? Our duty to the body means then the sanctity of the body as the vehicle of the life and mind of God. There is another reason also. We often forget how God has allied the unseen, and the seen together. All life is one sphere, but it is a sphere in which one half lies in shadow; the things seen lie in the light of the immediate present, but the other half is shadowed in things unseen and spiritual. These form but one sphere that is moving according to God's law. Upon my bodily condition depends for good or evil my mental power. The deranged frame means the dull wit and the weak will. Let the bodily fabric be disordered, and power is lost. Can you feel your heart ready of sympathy when you are distracted by pain or agony? What is your judgment worth when you are not in a fit state to make up your mind? We know that the external conditions of life act upon the whole state and condition of the heart and mind. It is certain that we can assist the mental life through the external organization, and as they teach the dumb to speak by teaching them first to observe the muscular movement of the lips, and the beginning of speech is thus given them, so it is true that with some the body is made the means of reaching the soul. Health in the soul is found to be helped by health in the body, and ill-health in the soul to be the result of a feeble and unhealthy condition of the bodily frame. So our Lord puts before us the practical aspect of life, and teaches the Church never to mistake the hysterical cry of a fictitious enthusiasm, which results from the unnurtured body, as the expression of the spirit of true religion. That is not Christ's teaching. Christ says: Give the full force of all, of the body, of the mind, and of the soul, unto God. Keep this body which Christ has sanctified, as pure, and strong, and healthy as it may be. There is a further duty of the Church towards the bodies of men. If we look into the world we find that because of the neglect of wholesome physical conditions sin and vice increase. Is it not because men cannot get in our large cities proper accommodation for their physical needs, that immorality grows? If men are so crowded together in our large centres of population, that they have not proper dwelling-places, do we not see that the public-houses are frequented, and low joys are sought for lack of better? But our Lord remembered the bodies of men, and taught that they should be cared for not for the sake of the body alone, but for the spirit's sake also. The vices which grow from the overcrowding of mankind can be reached best by approaching them from the physical side. We cannot make men spiritual when their physical surroundings are such that they can have no capacity for entering into the glories of unseen things. We must deal practically with these questions, and the duty of doing so our Lord taught, when He said, "Give ye them to eat."

(II.) But the duty of the Church is not only towards the bodies of men. The Church owes duty towards their souls. We must not fall from one extreme into the other. We have to see that men's physical surroundings are of the sweetest and best; we are to strive that they are provided with proper homes. *There* is a practical life for philanthropy. *There* is a noble sphere of work for men who have energy to enter upon it and carry it out. But if the Church of Christ, while attending to such, begins to ignore the other half of life, the spiritual side, do not its functions sink down to the level of a charity organization society? The body is the outward expression of man; and as words are nothing without thoughts, so man's form is nothing without the spirit that inhabits it. As the artist with his colours gathers them together, and by force of genius makes them live, because his own spirit finds utterance in their arrangement, so man is nothing in the external forms of life, save he makes felt the spirit that breathes within them. This our Lord teaches also. The eager Marthas of the Church, busy and anxious, have gone about cumbered with much serving, and have not sat at the Master's feet, as Mary. They have missed some of His teaching. Our Lord shows that He is so far material that He insists upon the care for men's bodies; but the moment that they have cared for the body, He shows the need of a care for the soul. He said to the multitude, "Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and fishes. Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life." That is to say: "I have cared for your wants, and now you follow Me because you think I can give you all that is needed for your bodies; but if I were only to minister to your material frame, I should not be discharging my duty to you. The temporal food which feeds your body is but the sign and symbol of the spiritual food which is to nourish your hearts. You are men, who require to be fed; but you are men who have a spirit within you that can approach God, and you need to be fed by heavenly food." And as He came into the world to be a Saviour of the body, and to minister to its needs, He is also the Saviour of the spirit, and will give to men the spiritual bread of life. The duty of the Church of Christ is to bear witness to this; and always to keep before men's minds the spiritual side of life.

We see how reasonable this is, for the form of things is not everything. There have been those who have affirmed that the way to paint the man is to paint the form of man. But this is not true, and that theory has long been exploded. An artist may be exact in the delineation of the form of the man, and yet, as we look, we miss the soul in the painting. For true work East and West must join hands. The idea of the East was, "We care not what the outer symbol is; let it but teach, even in the most grotesque and hideous form, the spiritual truth, we are satisfied." Then the Greek rose and said, "Not so; we will paint the form in all its glorious beauty, and the soul will look out of its eyes." Neither were right. The Oriental was right that the unseen was more than the things seen, and the Greek was right when he said the form should give expression to that which was spiritual, but he failed when he thought that in the mere delineation of form could the heart of things be reached. He is the best artist who touches the pulse of Nature, and hears that her voice is speaking in the midst of all her wondrous signs, and who feels that the beauty of her colouring is more than mere colour. As we look on the walls of our Academies, we know that the pictures which touch the hearts of men, and lift men higher, are not the dull mechanical representations of what *we* can see, but those which teach us that beyond the beauty of the clouds and the sky, there is a thought which is Divine. It is not in the outward only that power exists. As long as men live they know that the influence of the man mighty in deeds is through the force which is within. What do we mean by men's valour or courage? When you gather heroes and see them in the splendour of their physical training, are you only thinking of the strong arm? Are you not thinking of the soul which is within—for valour is the acting of the soul through the external nature? It is not the arm which hewed down the foe, but it is the indomitable spirit which urged the weak trembling frame to stand up and hold its own in spite of the appeal of the body not to thrust it into peril. Courage is a greatness in the spirit of man. The greatness is within, where is that "kingdom of God which is not meat and drink only," but which is righteousness, peace, and joy of the Holy Ghost. Thus the Church of Christ is to be the witness that life is not worth living unless the outward form be the expression of the spirit and the power of God living in the mind of man.

Our Lord emphasises the practical duty of caring for the bodies of men, but on the other hand He says, "This is not everything." The care for the needs of men is a solemn duty, but you must not teach men that when they have eaten and drunken, they may die. This is to forget that man is made to give expression to the divine thought. It is to forget that our spirits need the Bread of Heaven. But our Lord remembered all human needs. He is the Christ who cares for the body. He knows the weariness of mind which results from bodily labour. He knows the state of this poor worn-out frame. We worship no Christ who ignores the condition of our life, but we worship the Christ who, understanding the physical needs of nature, said, "They need not depart; give ye them to eat." But if He is a Christ who is loving and tender, He is ambitious for us. All true love is ambitious. We should not care to be loved by one whose love sought only to surround us with all the luxuries of life. Far better is the love which stirs us up to noble aspirations, and places before us the path in life that will be worthy of our exertions. Jesus Christ, while He shows that He can care for all physical needs, is the Christ that beckons men onward and places before them the path which is the path of real life. He bids men labour, but not merely for the bread which perisheth; He urges them not to set affections on these things, but to use them as instruments of God—to let both body and mind be strong, and to see that the life be fed with the bread which came down from heaven to fill the hungry with something better than the meat which perisheth. None of us then must sink down into an animal existence. We have been created for God;—we must hunger after the true bread of life; we must feed upon Him, that we may grow like unto Him. In this struggling life, indeed, we often feel as though we would fain put our burden down and leave it. But we need not give way, let us rise up again in strong spiritual heroism: gird our loins once more. Is it not well worth while to endure a little longer? Even out of this burden shall be given us the spiritual food that shall make us grow into His likeness, and when we wake up in His likeness, we shall be satisfied.

ANGLO-CATHOLICISM AND THE CHURCH.

BY PRINCIPAL A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D.

From *The Contemporary Review*, February, 1891.

In a previous paper* we discussed modern Anglo-Catholicism from its rise as an archæological theory of the Church to its transformation into a sacerdotal and symbolical system inspired by evangelical beliefs. The change is so marked, and has so affected the temper and methods of the men who embody the movement, that did we know only the first stage and the last we could not believe that they were moments in the life of the same party. Ritualism, while the most superficial, is the least characteristic sign of the change; one deeper and more real is the supersession of the old aristocratic spirit by one humaner and more democratic. The new men are possessed, as the old were not, by missionary zeal, by the passion to reach and reclaim the masses, by the endeavour to make the Church the attractive home of the people, and the people the obedient sons of the Church. The religious polemics of the older men were often inspired by the intensest political antipathy to Liberalism and all its works, even when these were philanthropic, or remedial; but the new men are distinguished by a progressive spirit, which has tempted the more forward to grapple, in the interests of the poor, with our graver social problems, and even to help in their practical solution. Of course the country has changed at once with the party and because of it, while common tendencies have been at work in both, shaping their respective activities, and modifying their mutual relations. The sense of responsibility to the people, which is, of course, a tribute levied by their accession to power, has penetrated what used to be called the governing classes; the men who serve the State live under a more jealous criticism, and the men who minister in the Church have become more conscious of duties, parochial and national. And for the clergy, the Anglo-Catholic revival has given at once form and sanction to this new consciousness of duty; it has made them, while more priestly, more evangelical, ministers of a more ornate service, studiously seeking to help worship by a richer symbolism, and to teach dogma by a more elaborate ceremonial. Under their hands the Church has become a new institution, more active, more aggressive, making claims that would have bewildered or amused the men of fifty years ago. But while merely academic claims are heard with scorn, claims supported by devoted lives, and illustrated by fulfilled duties, are, even when doubted, patiently endured. Respect is the simple right of the Anglo-Catholic men; rigorous examination of their claims is the duty of those who at once love religion and wish to obey the truth.

I.

1. In order to connect the present with the previous discussion, and to show how the newer Anglo-Catholicism stands related to the older, yet distinguished from it, we must attempt to discover and define their respective determinative principles. We may say, then, that the new men are less Anglican and more Catholic than the old; their Church, while no less political or institutional, is more ideal; they conceive it more through a dogma or a philosophy than through a fixed and provincial, or limited tradition. The old and the new agree in identifying what may be described as a given framework of the Church with its essence; they agree as to its polity, the value and function of its sacraments, the origin, necessity, gradation, and succession of its orders. These things must be that the Church may be; whatever may be changed or transcended, they must stand. In all its forms Anglo-Catholicism is a theory as to the necessity of a specific ministry to the Church, not of the Church to any ministry. But these points of agreement only emphasise the point of difference, with all that follows from it. This point may be stated thus: the determinative principle of the older men was historical—tradition,

---

* Contemporary Review, March 1890.

but the determinative principle of the younger men is metaphysical—a doctrine. What we may term the immanent idea is in each case different; in the one it was an objective model, or specific authority—certain Fathers as interpreted by certain Anglican divines; but in the other it is an underlying philosophy or theology, which penetrates and modifies the whole conception of the Church, and governs the methods and use of historical proof. This philosophy or theology may be conveniently described, though by a species of synecdoche, as the notion of the Church in its Catholic or Anglican sense as "naturally of a piece with the Incarnation";* in other words, the Church is so construed through the Incarnation as to experience a kind of apotheosis, as to become "a new and higher mode," or continued form of the profoundest mystery known to the Christian Faith. The poetry in the sublime and beautiful image of Paul, the Church is the body of Christ, is for the benefit of an institution turned into the most prosaic of prose. Truths that relate to the theanthropic Person. His sanctity, His sovereignty over mind, His authority over conscience through belief, become predicable of the Catholic Church which, as continuing the work of its Founder, is the only recognised way of man reaching God or God reaching man. "Access to God" is free to a man, provided he belongs to the one body; "fellowship with God" is possible "only through membership in the one body and by dependence on social sacraments," "of which ordained ministers are the appointed instruments." † And so the Church, taken as strictly an episcopal and sacerdotal institution, becomes the mystical and "Spirit-bearing" body,‡ created and inhabited by Christ, and possessed of all the energies, capabilities, and functions of a living organism. It may be conceived as a colossal individual whose years are centuries, whose life is continuous, and who is alone able, by virtue of its apostolic descent and proper administration of sacraments, to articulate and, as it were, realise Christ's presence on earth.

2. So much for the determinative idea; now a word or two as to its action on Anglo-Catholicism. For one thing, the point of emphasis was changed; it passed from the Patristic period to the Church as one, living, catholic, continuous. The change was, as it were, from the idea of the law that ruled the body to the idea of the body that made the law. The Church in a sense superseded the Fathers, and though Apostolic and Patristic voices are still heard with reverence, it is less as independent and more as organs through which the society has spoken; they must be canonised that they may have authority. But this change involves another: the authority the older men appealed to was specific and concrete, antiquity as understood by recognised Anglican scholars; but the authority of the younger men is more general and ideal, either a composite abstraction spoken of in historical terms as "the Catholic Church," or a series of selected opinions called "the Catholic tradition." By the very terms of the appeal, and the logical necessities of the situation, the authority appealed to is masked and made but an echo of the appealing voice, for an eclectic Catholicism is the most arbitrary of individualisms; it is but subjective tendencies or judgments done into ecumenical formulæ. And this involves another difference: the older men defended dogma by institutions, the younger defend institutions by dogma, which means that the attitude of the mind to the ideal contents of religion and to the intellectual tendencies of the age has changed. The old attitude to reason was hostile, the new is friendly; the older men had the idea of an authority that must be obeyed, but the younger have the idea of an authority that can be adapted to living thought. The Anglicans laboured so to organise the Church after a definite ideal that it might the more effectually resist the modern spirit, but the Catholics endeavour so to construe the traditional creed as to make it incorporate the ideas of the age. The Anglican idea of the Church was more concrete, and of authority more defined; while the Catholic idea of authority is more elastic, and of the Church, on the intellectual side, more flexible—so much so that it is conceived as able to assimilate all new material, to welcome and give place to all new knowledge.* In a word, a new philosophy, and, as a consequence, a new theology, has penetrated the Anglican system, and, though old terms and positions survive, the philosophy has just to be allowed to do its work, and the new will not be as the old.

II.

Now, my purpose is to attempt a criticism of this new Anglo-Catholicism from both the philosophical and historical sides, that is, to essay to examine it in the light both of its own fundamental idea and the new knowledge it has endeavoured to assimilate. This criticism proceeds from no lack of sympathy with the men who would bring the Christian faith into happy and efficient relation to the life and thought of to-day; indeed, its one purpose is to be a contribution to this aim. In order to such a relation, two things are necessary—equal and adequate justice must be done, on the one hand, to the Faith, and, on the other, to the mind and needs of the age. The system that does justice to neither does injury to both.

---

* Gore, "The Church and the Ministry," p. 64; "Lux Mundi," p. 367.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 93–94.

‡ "Lux Mundi," p. 321.

* "Lux Mundi," Preface, p. ix.

1. This determines the starting point of our criticism: the age must be looked at in relation to the Church, as well as the Church to the age. To the being of the age the Church has contributed; has therefore its own share of responsibility for what the age is. In the age it lives with this as its clear duty—to turn for living men the idealities of religion into the realities of being. Hence the problem of the age to the Church may be stated thus:—How can the Christian Faith be made to the living reason most credible and to the living conscience most authoritative? How can it be made so to pervade the atmosphere we breathe and impregnate the soil on which we grow as to be, as if by a natural process, incorporated into our being, or as to become the determinative factor of our personal characters, ideals, ends, and of our collective customs, institutions, laws? To have the problem so stated is to feel rebuked and humbled. We are in the nineteenth century of the Christian era; for almost all these centuries Christianity has lived on our soil, for the greater part of them we have been formally and ostensibly Christian. Yet we are faced by problems which imply that there are whole provinces of our national and social life where Christianity as a religion has little place and less force, and a multitude of minds for whom it has as a Faith no reality, no credibility, and no authority. At such a moment to profess pessimism were to confess to defeat; but to cultivate optimism were to prepare for extinction. No man who believes in the Christian religion can despair of its success; no man who loves his people can be satisfied with their state, or persuade himself that it proves the sufficiency of the church or churches which have been charged with the realisation of the religion. Class interests, passions, prejudices, still reign untempered by love; they have grown more bitter and dangerous since they have come to contend hand to hand, foot to foot, for the seat of sovereignty. The rebellion arms can quell may be easily ended; but the slow revolution worked by inexorable law mocks at arms or dynastic forces, and can be changed into a beneficent process only by the gracious energies of religion. Such a revolution is even now in process; but has religion so penetrated the people by whom it is being accomplished that the Church can watch its completion with a light heart and an easy conscience? Our political problems are grave, but our economical are graver, and still more grave are our social. Toward the solution of the economical many natural factors are cooperating; the intellects and energies engaged in the industries are, by combinations, councils, arbitrations, and enlarged education, contributing, by securing the more equal and equitable distribution of wealth, to the creation of happier conditions. But in the solution of our social problems the supreme factor is the religious, the factor that fashions upright, honourable, beneficent men, that substitutes the reign of ordering love for Rousseau's social contract or the iron hand of Hobbes' Strong Man. Of all States, a democratic most needs in its governors and guides, virtue, integrity, disinterestedness of motive, sanity of intellect, and inflexibility of moral will; but while we cultivate politics with passion, do we not leave the creation of the politician to chance? Have our people been constrained to conceive that the office of the statesman is not less sacred than the office of the churchman, and demands, because of its greater perils and more manifold temptations, a more enlightened conscience and a larger endowment of grace? Few things are more disastrous to a society than the substitution of conventional for moral standards of judgment, and is it too much to say that the society most purely ecclesiastical is also the most thoroughly conventional? Immoralities live as they have never lived before in the public eye, and the scandals of the West End do more to debauch the national conscience than all the sordid vice and gaunt poverty of the East. We seem to have reached a state where evil has more solidarity than good: rich and poor meet together, and understand each other more in their vices than in their religion, which ought to have destroyed their vices, root and branch. But within the community there lives this difference: the rich have the gift of oblivion in a higher degree than the poor. The easy conscience of society sweetly forgives the man who has sown his wild oats, but the retentive mem-

ory of the people does not so readily forget the ruin he may have worked in the process. These and things like these formulate grave problems for the Church. How have they come to be? How is their being to be ended? The higher the theory of the Church the deeper ought to be the notion of its responsibility; the greater our idea of its power and its function the more sternly must we judge its failure. Wisdom is justified by her works, but if the works are not there, or there in an altogether inadequate degree, what becomes of the justification?

2. But deeper than all others are the problems that concern belief. The living intellect and the historical faith have somehow drifted, if not asunder, yet out of relation, and where truth does not live to the reason it can have no authority for the conscience. The characteristic of the age is here not so much unbelief as a want of belief, so extensively and uniformly diffused as to represent a common tendency rather than specific causes. It is distributed through all classes, and is peculiar to none, though it receives in each characteristic expression. Among the less skilled labourers it is simply indifference; poverty shows no mercy to ideals, thinking that what brings no amelioration is entitled to no reverence. The man who with hungry mouths to feed struggles with failing strength to feed them, will not long continue to find comfort in contemplating the beauty and sufficiency of abstract truth. The response of the poor to a religion which has no concern or cure for poverty, is neglect of the religion. Again, the hard-headed artisan has difficulties of another and more varied order, and they grow with his rather moody and defiant independence. He is proud, sensitive to small things, especially if touched with affront or condescension or disdain, and conscious of a manhood too honourable to brook those class and caste distinctions that are often only the more emphasised by the circumstances and conventions of common worship. Or he brings a vigorous intellect, all the severer in its logic for being without formal culture, to bear on formulæ that have survived their occasion or lost their original sense, and yet have in his mind continued to be identified with the essence of religion, and he forthwith resolves the formulæ and the religion into a series of fantastic absurdities, which only folly or knavery or the blindest self-interest can tempt men to believe. The parson or preacher he regards with lofty scorn as the mercenary impersonation of all the superstitions he most despises, and his most effective and offensive weapons of assault he draws from the Old Testament Scriptures conceived as so inspired that every word, character, and event is due to the direct action of the Almighty. In the educated classes similar types of unbelief, often in still cruder forms, are represented, only here fashion and current tendencies account for more. The fleshly materialism of our gilded youth, too gross to care for any intellectual justification, is an utterly vile thing; while noble purposes may live within and speak through the reason and conscience of the secularist artisan. The doubt that is too indolent to reason or to be reasoned with, or that is indulged as a private intellectual luxury, or that is used to give point and flavour to an otherwise vacuous cynicism, the agnosticism that speaks the language of one set, and the pessimism that repeats the formulæ of another, the cultivated indifference that treats as bad form every allusion to religion, the culture that believes in translating dogma into the language of the club or the coterie, the scientific temper that despises religion, or benevolently deals with it as if it were a thing for weak or dishonest intellects, because it does not follow the processes or attain the results of some science misdescribed as exact—these and many similar phases of floating opinion may be found in society and in literature. They are easily over-estimated, easily under-estimated, and still more easily misconceived. Singly they may be insignificant, but collectively their significance is immense. They mean that the unsettlement of belief is general; that men cannot think, or speak, in the society of the thoughtful, without feeling it; that in religious matters it is true courtesy to assume difference, and avoid speech; and that it is only reasonable to suppose that every new science will be in conflict with the old faith. But the fateful agitation is not the superficial; it is rather the deeper movement of thought that throws up and throws out the bubbles and eddies of the surface. The old conception of nature and man, of the universe and its history, is breaking up; a new conception is making its way into the collective consciousness, and becoming the regulative principle of all its thinking, with the inevitable result that religious beliefs, if they are to live, must undergo a correspondent transformation. Our most real and radical scientific inquiries raise questions as to creation, the Creator and His mode of working, as to man and his origin, the being of sin, the birth of religion, the reality of prog-

ress; our most rigorous and fruitful historical inquiries deal with the genesis of social and religious institutions, the evolution of thought, the formation and growth, now of mythologies, now of theologies; the place and composition of religious books, the appearance and action of religious personalities; and these in the most inexorable way compel men, if they would be reasonable while religious, to ask how the new methods affect their own beliefs. The scientific temper of to-day may be described as a passion to explore and explain origins, and to find out the reason and method of a thing's becoming; and it is so universal that no belief or institution can escape the inquiry, how, when, and why it came to be. This means that the ultimate problem of a Church is not to explain the faith it has authoritatively defined, but to vindicate the process by which it became possessed of the authority to define it, the competence to enforce what it has defined. Hence the final word of our age to Anglo-Catholicism, and all modes of theology and religion by authoritative institutions is this: What claims to authenticate our most fundamental beliefs must have nothing dubious about its own title deeds.

These paragraphs have not been all digression; they have made one thing evident: the religion has not been so interpreted by the societies or Churches whose mission it is to realise it as to have penetrated, possessed and commanded the English people. We are still far from the kingdom of heaven; and of all evidences of truth, alike as regards a man and a society, the most infallible is the ancient canon, "By their fruits ye shall know them." This is not to be construed as a word of reproach against the English Church as a Church. The writer feels that there is nothing less noble or more despicable than the mutual reproaches of religious men and societies, or the memory too mindful of past faults, and too forgetful of present duties, especially those of charity and truth; but what he means is, that those who claim that a given Church is the one and exclusive divinely created and guided Church of Christ for the English people, are not dealt with seriously unless their Church be required to have lived up to its character, and have proved it through its works. There is no tribute to a man or institution like the demand that he or it be no less or no worse than his or its claims. Now, it is not too much to say, in the face of what has been said, that the Church has not made its supernatural character obvious by its works; and for an institution that must be supernatural to be anything at all, this is certainly a serious circumstance. If its character and claims are things that have still, after all these centuries of opportunity and endeavour, to be proved by an argumentative and evidential process, then the process must be cogent indeed, sufficient at least to satisfy a reason both scientific and reverent. An age which deeply reveres good things well done, but is dubious and slow of conviction as to high abstract claims, is a trying age for a system or a society whose claims are mainly abstract, and whose evidences are not very apparent in the realm of the real.

III.

Our first concern must be with the most radical matter—the doctrine of the Church.

We have already seen something of the claims made by the Anglo-Catholics on its behalf. It is Christ's Spirit-bearing body, "the special and covenanted sphere of His regular and uniform operations." * The Church has a finality which belongs to its very essence, "expressed in the once for all delivered faith, in the fulness of the once for all given grace, in the Visible Society once for all instituted," "and in a once for all empowered and commissioned ministry." † By virtue of the first it is the custodian and interpreter of the truth; by virtue of the second it possesses the Sacraments, which are instruments for the communication of grace; because of the third the Church is a political unity into which man must be incorporated to be truly and effectually saved; in the fourth "the instrument of unity" is supplied, "and no man can share her (the Church's) fellowship except in acceptance of the offices of her ministry." ‡ Now, of these the last is the greatest and most essential; though it may be argued, all are alike necessary and distinction between necessities cannot be drawn; yet here this distinction exists, the apostolic ministry is the condition through which the other things are; it is primary, they are secondary and sequent; without it there can be no unity, no sacramental grace, no authoritative transmission and definition of truth; with it these things cannot but be.

1. Now, what does this doctrine mean? Is it a theory of the ministry or of the community, of the political system or of the people who live under it, and for whose good it exists; of the forms under which communion is decreed to be possible, or of

---

* "Lux Mundi," pp. 321–332.

† "The Church and the Ministry," pp. 64–65. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 86.

the saints who hold communion? The question as to the relation between the various factors constitutive of the State—the Sovereign and the Citizens, the Magistracy and the People, the polity and the community—is as old as the study of politics, and it is as much native and as necessary in the ecclesiastical as in the civil sphere. In both there are the same types of political theory, involving questions identical in principle and substance, though somewhat different in form, as to the origin, basis, limits, conditions, and ends of authority. The types may, after Aristotle, be distinguished into three, each capable of existing in two forms, a legitimate and an illegitimate, the monarchical, the aristocratic, or oligarchical, and the constitutional or democratic.* If monarchical, the monarchy may be either absolute or limited; if absolute, it will be in the civil sphere an Autocracy, in the ecclesiastical a Papacy—its attribute in the realm of civil law being supremacy, but in the ecclesiastical, as the realm of opinion, infallibility. If it be a limited monarchy, the limitation must come either from the law, which stands above the king and makes him a responsible ruler, or from a co-ordinate authority which stands over against and qualifies his. In the ecclesiastical sphere the former is represented by the Gallican theory, the latter by what we may call the Frankish and the older Teutonic theories or customs, which governed the relations between Church and State before the days of Hildebrand and the Hohenstaufen. If the political type be oligarchical, it becomes in the civil system an aristocracy, in the ecclesiastical either a hierocracy or an episcopacy. Its distinctive note is that it must be self-perpetuating; *i.e.*, the means of continuing and propagating the order must be within the order, and cannot be delegated to any one or anything without. This is secured in the aristocratic and in certain hierocratic systems by a rigid law of hereditary inheritance, but in the episcopal by an equally rigid law of official succession, ordination or consecration of bishops by bishops; in other words, accession to office by act and sanction of those who already hold it. Of course, each of these systems has a theory of origin corresponding to its own peculiar form and needs. Where the law of hereditary inheritance reigns, the theory is, in the civil sphere, either supernatural, an ordination of God, or natural, due to the superior strength or wisdom of some ancestor, or to some imaginary contract; but in the ecclesiastical sphere, it is the creation or election by God of some special family or tribe; while where the law of official succession reigns, it as naturally seeks its warrant or justification in a doctrine of divine institution and transmitted authority. If, again, the political type be democratic, it may either be indirect and representative, where the authority is delegated to certain persons, either of a special order, or simply as citizens of good repute; or it may be direct and collective, where the enfranchised, or simply the citizens, act together and as a whole. The former has its counterpart in the civil realm, though only in a very partial degree, in ancient Rome; in a fuller degree in our modern Republics; but in the ecclesiastical it takes shape as Presbytery. The latter may be seen, on the one hand, in the ancient Greek cities, on the other, in the Independent or Congregational Churches.

But one thing marks all these political types—they are polities, methods and forms of government, of immense significance as such, but as no more. Taken at their very utmost valuation, they represent the framework of the State, do not describe its essence, they affect and condition, but do not constitute its life. A Greek city might change from a tyranny to an oligarchy, or to a democracy, but it remained Greek still. Rome did not cease to be when the Republic became the Empire; France has tried many polities, but still remains France. The State is the people; the polity is the system under which they are organized, and which may be changed without any change of the people. Salmasius said, "It is absurd to argue that kingdoms were before kings, for it is through kings that kingdoms are; did no king reign there could be no kingdom." But Milton replied, "Kingdoms, indeed, were not before kings, but peoples were, and it is for and through peoples that both kings and kingdoms exist." And it is the same in the ecclesiastical as in the civil realm; it is neither the bishops nor the clergy that constitute the Church, but the Church that constitutes the clergy. The Church was before they were; they are by it, and through it, and for it; they owe their being and succession to it; it does not depend for its unity upon them, but upon its Head and its relation to Him. The people are His; without His people no polity can be. With His people, some polity must be, but of what sort it is not for any special order to determine.

Now, the cardinal vice of this Anglo-Catholicism is that it makes the secondary element primary, the primary secondary, and turns a mere ecclesiastical polity, which has lost touch of the concrete and the real, into a substantive doctrine of the Church. It makes the polity, instead of the people, the constituent factor or authority. It affirms the apostolic descent of the clergy, but forgets the apostolic descent of the Church. It argues concerning the ministry as men in the seventeenth century used to argue concerning the king; the divine rights once claimed for him are still claimed for priests, and proved in similar methods by the help of similar assumptions. And the similarity does not end with Filmer. It represents too deep a tendency in human nature to be without analogies, as every student of comparative religion knows only too well, in wider and more distant fields. But one thing is clear: no theory of either the Church or its polity can be adequate which does not do justice to the facts, that is, to the collective Christian people, and the creative Source of all their life. The best polity for a State is the polity that secures the greatest possible good to the whole, doing completest justice alike to the obscurest citizen and the most illustrious, but the polity that shuts outside the Church as immense a body of holy men as are to be found within it, is a polity that does no justice to the ways of God or the actual condition of man. In all questions of this sort there are two points of view: Men may reason downwards from the polity to the people, and say, "The Maker of the world, the Founder of the society, made this polity which we embody and administer, and you cannot be His people unless you live under His polity; on it, and our administration of it, His grace so depends that without us and our instruments it will not be communicated to you." Or men may reason upwards from the people to the polity, and say: "God made the people, His Spirit renewed them, inhabits them. The polity must express and represent the Spirit of God in the people; articulate, organise, and direct their energies. They are first, it is second; proceeds, indeed, from God, but comes through them, and only what is their creation has His sanction." Of these two points of view, the former may be termed the high clerical, the latter the high Church. What begins and ends with the ministry may exalt the clergy; what exalts the Church must never lose hold of the people, the saints called and approved of God.

---

* "Politics," iii. 7.

2. Enough has been said as to this distinction, but its theological and historical significance may be illustrated by a phrase elaborately despised and misunderstood by Anglo-Catholics—"The Invisible Church." The date of its origin is a small matter. New conditions so combine or affect old ideas as to demand new names. If theology used no terms, or allowed no ideas save those found in the Fathers, its life would soon cease, and nowhere sooner than in Anglo-Catholicism. One thing is certain, the phrase represents elements and ideas the Reformers owed to Augustine. His doctrine of the Church was confronted with two great difficulties, one real or social, the other ideal or theological. The real was the presence within it of the unworthy, the impure, or the hypocritical—men who did not belong to the Society of the Saved. Hence he had to distinguish between the ideal and the actual or the real and counterfeit Church.* The Reformers had to face this contradiction in a far more aggravated form, and they said, "Since these impure, hypocritical men, though they are visibly within are really without the Church, let us cease to use false words, and say—of the Church as God knows it, They are no members. Our actual is not identical with God's ideal." But the theological difficulty was more serious; Augustine's Church, as sacerdotal, was conditional—by acts and sacraments men could be incorporated into it; but his theology was unconditional—grace was absolute, and men were saved by the will of God.† If the decree is absolute in the theology, the ecclesiology cannot be allowed to make salvation conditional; yet a conditional salvation is of the very essence of a Church that saves or communicates grace by the sacraments. Hence, Augustine might have argued that men were predestinated to baptism, but he could not consistently argue that men were regenerated through baptism. And as in face of the facts he could not maintain, as his two doctrines required, that there were only the elect within the Church and only the reprobate without, and as he had to admit that

---

* "De Doctr. Christ." iii. 32. Non enim revera Domini corpus est, quod cum illo non erit in æternum: sed dicendum fuit, De Domini corpore vero atque permixto, aut, vero atque simulato, vel quid aliud; quia non solum in æternum, verum etiam nunc hypocritae non cum illo esse dicendi sunt, quamvis in ejus esse videantur Ecclesia. Unde poterat ista regula et sic appellari, ut diceretur de permixta (instead of *bipartita*) Ecclesia. *Cf.* "Unit. Eccl." c 23. Multi sunt in sacramentorum communione cum ecclesia et tamen jam non sunt in ecclesia. "Cont. Litt. Petil. ii. 10, 24. Dico ad semen Abrahae, quod est in omnibus gentibus, non pertinere, si quid non recte vobis factum est, fortasse a palea dominicae segetis." This division was so sharp in Augustine, that he, like the Reformers, was charged with believing in the existence of duas Ecclesias. "Brevic. Coll. cum Donat." iii. 10. The criticism was just as valid in the one case as in the other, and no more!

† *Cf.* with above, Augus., "In Joh. Evang." xlv. 12. "Secundum istam ergo præscientiam Dei et prædestinationem, quam multæ oves foris, quam multi lupi intus; et quam multæ oves intus, et quam multi lupi foris!"

there were elect as well as reprobates without, and reprobates as well as elect within, he had to allow the two positions to remain as unreconciled antitheses, or rather as radical contradictions. The elect were the real members of the Church, the non-elect, though in its communion, were but semblances. The reformed theologians developed Augustine's position into logical consistency by conceiving the Church through its ultimate constitutive factor, the will of God. So construed, it became the society of the elect, or company of the predestinated, or, simply, the Church invisible, while the visible was the mixed body who lived in outward profession. But this only showed that the inheritance of Augustine was divided; the Catholics succeeded to his polity, the Reformers to his theology. The anti-Donatist was the Father of the visible Church, but the anti-Pelagian, the Father of the invisible.

But this leaves us with the question, What did the Reformers mean by the phrase "Invisible Church"? We can easily see what they did not mean. They did not intend to reduce, but rather to enhance the reality, necessity, and importance of the visible Church * within which the invisible lived and without which it could not be.† Nor did they mean to deny the unity and continuity of the Church; but rather to affirm both, though in a form that aimed at being just to all the facts, and the whole truth as to the redeeming activity of God.‡ Nor did they use the phrases, as Bellarmine with the skilful misunderstanding of controversial genius maintained, to denote two Churches, but rather to express two ideas that were related as the body and soul of man.§ The "Invisible Church" was no "Civitas Platonica," nor was the visible an organised accident, or series of expediencies. Each was necessary to the other, and both to the complete expression of so rich and complex an idea as the Church of Christ. In the first place, that could not be an "ecclesia sensibilis," for did not the Creed say, "I *believe* in the Holy Catholic Church?" But the things of faith are invisible; God who loves, Christ who saves, the Spirit which renews the soul, are unseen; unseen, too, is the soul they love, and save, and renew; and unseen the society constituted of God out of this and all other souls He has saved. In the next place, the body that claims to be the one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church does not possess any one of its attributes; it is not one, for it is divided into many sects, and has been the fruitful mother of divisions; it is not holy, for within and over it are many evil men; and to its working, evil forces have contributed as powerfully as good; it is not Catholic, for it is Roman; nor is it Apostolic, for it has exchanged the ministry of service for the functions of empire. Over against and within this political and juridical body stands the Society of the saints of God, enjoying a communion, which, though informal or unconscious, is real in proportion as it is rooted in the Divine. Again, the saving of man is an act and work of grace; all its terms are spiritual and free; its very nature would be changed were it bound to institutions of man's making and ordering. Justification by an institution is the very negation of justification by faith; the more it is magnified the more is the sole ability to justify of the spiritual Person who impersonates the saving energies of God limited and lowered, and His claim to achieve through faith the saving change in man, qualified and conditioned. Then, as it is persons God saves, it is a people He constitutes; and as He loves them, and they love Him, they must be able to enjoy His fellowship in spite of anything any juridical society on earth has done or can do. Under this aspect, there is a double idea to express, the idea that all who love God form a society with, and before, and under the God they love, and the idea that this society, as bound to no terms of man's making, is realised in the realm of the transcendental and eternal. Now, what term can better express this double idea than "Invisible Church?" It lifts us at once into the region where all the realities are transcendental and all are spiritual, where God is all in all to man and man lives in conscious fellowship with God, and loving obedience to Him.

3. We have been concerned, not with the truth or falsity of the idea, simply with the meaning and import of the phrase; but this much may be said: it has more of the historical and Catholic spirit than the phrase in whose interest it has been so proudly despised. It was an attempt to find an idea of the Church as large and deep as the activity of God, yet as varied and free as the spirit of man. It endeavoured to rescue

---

* Of it John Calvin said:—"Discamus vel uno matris elogio quam utilis sit nobis ejus cognitio, imo necessaria; quando non alius est in vitam ingressus nisi nos ipsa concipiat in utero, nisi pariat, nisi nos alat suis uberibus, denique sub custodia et gubernatione sua nos tueatur, donec exuti carne mortali similes erimus angelis." "Inst. Rel. Christ." iv. 1, 4. Cf. Catechis. Major, ii. 3, 42.

† Hence the formula: "Ecclesia invisibilis non extra visibilem est quaerenda, sed illa huic est inclusa."

‡ "Apol. Confes. Augus." art. iv. p. 146.

§ Luther, Werke, xviii. p 12–15 (ed. Walch). Cf. Hollazius, p. 1283. And Gerhard, "Loci," xi. 81, 82, and "Confes. Cath." p. 207 (ed. 1679).

the people of God from bondage to a juridical letter, and restore them to their rightful place in His spiritual order. There was nothing Luther more loved to say and to emphasise than this—Church meant people, saintly, Catholic, Christian, daily being sanctified and made into a holy Christendom. And in so speaking he agreed with the Catholicity of the Early Ages. As Justin counted all truth to be of Christ, as Clement found prophecy in Hellenic philosophy as well as in the Hebrew Law, as Augustine believed that there had been a Christianity before Christ, so Luther held, translating the Patristic abstract into his own brave concrete, that wherever the holy soul is, whether under the Papacy or amid the Turks, there is the Church. And simply because so transcendental and divine, it must have a phenomenal form. The finite persons who compose it are men ; its Founder was an historical Person, and defined the elements necessary to the visible being of His society. These are two, the Word and the Sacraments, or the Gospel by which men are saved, and the symbols which at once express their relation to a common Head and bind them into a common Brotherhood. Where these are there is a Church ; more than these need not be. Forms of polity are matters to be determined by saved people, not by consecrated priests. The people are primary, the polity is secondary, and the polity which best articulates the religion for the people and best organises the people for the purposes of the religion, is for the time and place the best polity. Particular churches with their specific polities do not break the unity of the Catholic Church visible, while their faith and love constitute the unity of the invisible. It is only where accidents are made of the essence of the Church that schisms are created, for schism is but an ordinance of man turned into an imperative law of God, and as such forced upon His free people. The phrase " visible and invisible Church" may be open to manifold criticisms, for the idea was large, and human speech is limited, and the ability to read the mind within it more limited still ; but surely we may say that in all the elements of sublimity and Catholicity, official Catholicism, especially in its Anglican form, is alongside this belief of " the new sectaries of the sixteenth century" only as " moonlight unto sunlight, and as water unto wine."

IV.

But to return ; our contention hitherto has been that the Anglo-Catholic is no theory of the Church, but only of a specific polity, or, in other words, it is the doctrine that certain officials or an oligarchy of a given kind is necessary to the existence of the ecclesia. This, however, is too abstract a contention to stand alone, and may be answered thus : " We are not dealing with a natural society, but with a society at once supernatural and historical. What its constitution is, is a question of revelation and history. Our Church is the Church Christ founded ; its constitution is of His making, not of ours ; His laws we are free to obey, but not to change." The question now becomes one of historical criticism and exegesis ; as such it is too large to be dealt with here ; all that is possible is to discuss a cardinal point here and there.

The appeal is, in the first instance, to the New Testament. What sort of society did the Founder of Christianity institute ? Was it constituted on the lines of this Catholicism, emphasising an oligarchical and sacerdotal polity as the *sine qua non* of the Church ? What this system conceives to be the Church, is, as it conceives it, not simply the most vital thing in the Christian religion, but is the religion ; on it everything depends, Scriptures, doctrine, acceptable worship, faith, and life. Without is " the sphere of the uncovenanted mercies" of God ; within are the known and recognised operations of His grace. Now, it is evident that a matter not simply fundamental, but through and through essential to the being of the religion, ought to be of all things the clearest and most indubitable in the religion, especially to all those who have no wish but to know it in its purest and believe it in its truest form. Is it so ? Has the Founder, or have His apostles, made the main lines or elements in this Catholicism so explicit that we must hold it as the only and veritable and imperative law of His society ? This is our present question.

1. Now, the first thing to be noted is this —a curious contrast between the language of Jesus and our modern Catholics. Their phrase is " the Church ;" His is " the kingdom of Heaven" or " of God," or simply " My kingdom." The mere figures are significant : the term " kingdom" is used in the Gospels to denote His society 112 times, and almost always by Himself ; but " Church" only twice. In a recent Anglican essay on the Church, the phrase " kingdom of heaven" occurs but twice ; in a book of 424 pages on " the Church and the Ministry," which has much to say about the " Ministry," but almost nothing about the " Church," only three pages are devoted to

a perfunctory discussion of the relation between the Church and the kingdom. Now, the names are either synonymous or they are not. If they are synonymous, it must be possible to translate the Church into the terms of the kingdom, and the kingdom into the terms of the Church. If they are not, then the kingdom as Christ's most used, most emphasised, and most descriptive name for His society, must contain His determinative idea; *i.e.*, the Church must be construed through the kingdom, not the kingdom through the Church. If the first position be chosen, then the Anglicans who have so forgotten the kingdom have failed to interpret the Church; if the second, then there is behind and beneath the Church another, as it were, aboriginal idea of the Christian society to which they have given no adequate recognition, and for which they have found no fit place. In the one case, their idea of the Church is not adequate; in the other, their Church is not the ultimate normal polity or social ideal of Jesus.

The idea of the kingdom, then, is primary. He comes to found or create it. His instrument is preaching or teaching;[*] His message is the gospel of the kingdom.[†] He is the Sower who casts the seed, which is the Word, into the hearts of men.[‡] He defines it by various terms; it is "of heaven"[§] in contradistinction to the "kingdoms of the world," *i.e.*, it has none of the violence, the policies, the evils of the earth; it is "of God"[‖] in distinction from "the kingdom of Satan," *i.e.*, it is the realm of healing, harmony, love, and beneficence. It is a kingdom of the truth, *i.e.*,[¶] He is a King by virtue of His being and bearing witness to the truth, and His citizens are the men who, being of the truth, hear His voice. It is present,[**] men may enter it,[††] are even within it,[‡‡] the terms of entrance are obedience to the Word,[§§] or the child-like spirit.[‖‖] It comes without observation,[¶¶] spreads quietly like leaven,[***] grows like seed.[†††] It is ethical in character; to seek it is to seek the righteousness of God,[‡‡‡] to pray for its coming is to ask that the will of God may be done on earth as in heaven.[§§§] The men it honours and rewards are the poor in spirit, the persecuted for righteousness' sake, those who do the will of God, confess Christ before men, cultivate His spirit, live His life of ministry and grace.[*] The signs of the kingdom are all spiritual and ethical, relate to gracious helpfulness and service, never to officers or acts of ceremonial.[†] It is universal, open to all, without respect to place or race.[‡]

Now, two remarkable things are suggested by these characteristics: (1) the essential notes of the kingdom are not those of the Catholic Church or, conversely, the essential notes of the Church are not to be discovered in the language of Christ as to the kingdom; (2) The emphasis in His speech falls not upon the officials, if officials there be, or on Sacramental acts, if such acts there are, but upon the people, upon persons, their personal qualities, conduct, character, their state and living before God, their behaviour and ministry among men. He, indeed, calls disciples and commissions apostles, but He deals with them as men who must be of a given spirit if they would enter the kingdom; their eminence in it depends, not on office, but on spiritual qualities; and their rewards, not on dignities possessed, but on range and kind of service—none being sacerdotal, all spiritual and human.

And this is made more significant by two things, His example and His instructions. He is their type, they are to be as He is and has been—one who heals, helps, saves, a Minister to all the needy.[§] He is a Teacher, a Preacher, whose word has power. He makes no sacerdotal claim, does no sacerdotal act. His ministry is more in Galilee than in Judea, in the synagogue than in the temple; He is the Rabbi, is never to any man, least of all to Himself, the priest. If the ministry is to be received through Him, and He is to remain the ideal all who enter ought to seek to realise, then it must be a ministry that neither renders, nor cultivates, nor practises sacerdotal sanctities, but is inspired by the enthusiasm for service, by the love of man, by fear of evil, by the passion to heal and to save, by the gentle hand, the generous heart, the gracious presence, the tongue eloquent to persuade the wicked to become the good. And as was His example, such were his instructions.[‖] He sent His disciples out to preach, to heal, to live as He lived, to suffer as He suffered, to seek His ends, to surrender, as He surrendered, all to God; to be prophets, as He was a prophet; to represent Him, as He represented God. Yet nowhere is there a phrase or term that so much as hints at any sacerdotal office, or act, or any official accessories. The only text that may seem to touch on peculiar official functions or powers is the saying to Peter: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven."* But the verse must be read in its connection. Peter had made his confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"; on this rock, this truth confessed, His Church was to be built; and the confessor, the man who stood by this truth, preached it, obeyed it, was, as such, to have the keys. It was not an absolute promise to an official, or to a man who holds an office, made because he held it, and to his successors, for of succession or successors there is no word; but it is a promise to a person who has made a confession, because of the confession he has made. And this is made apparent by the next paragraph, where Peter, because he rebukes Jesus for prophesying of His death, receives the awful rebuke: "Get thee behind me, Satan!" † Each saying is appropriate to the moment, neither is absolute, nor significant of a permanent character, or inalienable office, or indefeasable function, but is through and through conditional, and relevant to the context. Peter, so far forth as he would dissuade Christ from His supreme act of sacrifice, is Satan, an enemy and tempter; so far forth as he confesses the highest truth as to Christ, Christ has committed to him the "keys of the kingdom." Both must be conditional, or both absolute; but it were hardly reasonable to conceive Peter as through all time filling the incompatible offices of Satan and the keeper of the keys. And so this instance but emphasises the truth. Here is a kingdom without any political framework, without any machinery of chartered officials, or spheres of "covenanted mercies," or "recognised channels," or "authorised instruments of grace," but composed of holy men, distinguished by their love and ministry, extended by the preaching of the Word, or the persuasive influence of spiritual character. It represents a unity which no type of polity can create or express, and which varied and even dissimilar polities need not break up or dissolve. It is visible, yet invisible; all its springs, motives, ends, the souls in which it lives, the God who reigns through the conscience, and the conscience in which God reigns, are all unseen; but all its evidences and fruits, the evils it cures, the good it does, the beneficences it works, are seen. Paul defined it through its distinctive elements once for all: "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."* If we seek its nearest analogy we shall find it in the visible invisible Church of the Reformers; if we seek its deepest contrast, where is it likelier to be found than in the canonised offices of recrudescent Catholicism?

---

[*] Matt. iv. 17, 23.

[†] Matt. ix. 35; Mark i. 14; Lu. viii. 1.

[‡] Matt. xiii. 3, 19, 23, *cf.* xxiv. 7, and John xviii. 36.

[§] Matt. v. 19; xviii. 4; xix. 12.

[‖] Matt. xii. 28, *cf.* 26; Lu. xi. 20, *cf.* 17, 18.

[¶] John xviii. 37.

[**] Lu. xvii. 21; Matt. v. 3, xii. 28; Mark x. 14.

[††] Matt. xxi. 31.

[‡‡] Matt. xi. 11; Lu. vii. 28.

[§§] Matt. xii. 19, 52.

[‖‖] Matt. xxiii. 3; xix. 14.

[¶¶] Luke xvii. 20.

[***] Matt. xiii. 33.

[†††] Matt. xiii. 31, 32.

[‡‡‡] Matt. vi. 33.

[§§§] Matt. vi. 10.

[*] Matt. v. 3, 10; vii. 21; xxxv. 1, 34.

[†] Matt. xi. 2-12; Lu. iv. 18-19.

[‡] Matt. viii. 11.

[§] Matt. xviii. 1-4; xxv. 34-40.

[‖] Matt. x. 5 ff.

2. We come now to the more familiar and distinctively apostolic name for the Society of Christ, the Church. It occurs in the Acts and the Epistles, including the Apocalypse, exactly the same number of times as kingdom in the Gospels, 112; while kingdom appears in only 29 cases. Our first concern is with its meaning, which will also help us to see the reason of its later extensive use. In the LXX. *ἐκκλησία* had translated the Hebrew *Kahal,* the congregation or assembly of the people; in Greek it was the assembly of the enfranchised or qualified citizens met to transact the affairs of the city or state. Into the New Testament usage both Hebrew and Greek elements entered, but, owing to associations and experience, the Greek were much more potent than the Hebrew. It has a double application, a local or particular, and an illocal or universal, but in both cases the emphasis falls on the community—the people—the constituents, as it were, of the society, rather than the constituted agencies. The local use admits of the plural, but the illocal of the singular only; and in our interpretation of the term it will be easiest to proceed from the concrete and definite to the larger and more comprehensive sense.

i. The local *ἐκκλησίαι* were essentially societies of the enfranchised or saved. Paul addressed his Epistles, so far as they were not directly personal, to the collective body or Church, which is described, now as "all the beloved of God," now as "those sanctified in Christ Jesus," now as "saints," and again, as "the faithful brethren." † The ministers are only once specified,‡ and not as intermediaries or a necessity to the being of the Church. The very purpose of his great Epistles is to instruct or persuade free and autonomous societies. Each body is a unit, but its unity is not secured by any office; it is rather because it is a body that it has many members with varied ministries.§ The lists of these are significant; they represent preaching, teaching, and various beneficences, but nothing sacerdotal, no sanctity peculiar to the office. The argument in First Corinthians is specially striking. God has set in His Church apostles, prophets, teachers, miracles, gifts; but there is something more excellent than these, without which these are but vacant things—the love that never faileth. Each Church was a brotherhood, for all were sons of God,* yet each was a legislative and judicial body. The judgment of a majority was efficient to punish,† and "a spirit of meekness" was held necessary to true discipline.‡ In an aggravated case Paul seeks to have his judgment executed, not independently of the Church, but through it.§ Commendatory epistles were given by the Church;‖ charities and gifts were its common act.¶ If the Church had a representative it was by election, *χειροτονηθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν*.** And in these respects the Church is in Acts as it is in the Pauline Epistles. The election of Matthias to the place of Judas was by the brethren.†† The seven deacons were chosen by the whole multitude.‡‡ It was the Church in Jerusalem which sent forth Barnabas as far as Antioch.§§ It was before the same Church collectively (*πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος*) that Barnabas and Paul declared what God had done through them, and it was "the Apostles and Elders, with the whole Church" (*σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*) which selected delegates to bear their message to Antioch.‖‖ The Church was thus "the multitude of those who believed," or "all who believed," or "the multitude of disciples," ¶¶ constituting its officers, not constituted by them. Power, authority was in the society, not in its ministers. And here we may understand one of the two cases where Jesus speaks of the Church.*** The address is to the disciples on offences between brethren. First, He says, the sufferer is to reprove the sinner alone; if the sinner will not listen, two witnesses are to be taken; if he still refuses to hear, the Church is to be told; if he refuse to hear the Church, he is to be treated as a "heathen man and a publican." Now, Church is here used in its strict local sense; it is a single society, and authority is said to reside in it, not in any office or officers. And it is of the Church in this sense that Christ uses the words: "Whatsoever things you shall bind on the earth will be bound in heaven; and whatsoever things you shall loose on the earth will be loosed in heaven." And it is to a similar body, the Church he had built on the foundation, "which is Jesus Christ," that Paul said, "Ye are God's temple," "the Spirit of God dwells in you."* The most gracious sanctities, the severest authorities, the highest dignities belonged to the Church, not through any official priesthood—for there was none—but through the personal relation to Christ of the men who formed it, and His presence in their midst.

---

* Matt. xvi. 19.

† Matt. xvi. 21-23.

* Rom. xiv. 17.

† Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1; Ephes. i. 1; Col. i. 1.

‡ Phil. i. 1.

§ Rom. xii. 4-8; 1 Cor. xii. 12-28.

ii. The ideal of the local is realised in the illocal Church, and we must understand it before we can really measure the dream of the new-born faith with the proud creations of the historical religion. Within the New Testament thought is not stationary, and the great example of progressive enrichment is the idea of the Church. In the earlier Pauline Epistles the actual Christians fill the foreground; but the later may be said to live, and move, and have their being in the Church, ideal and illocal. The development begins with an individual Church, but ends with a universal; thought, conditioned by experience, starts with a unit, but works towards a unity. At first we have what may be termed a mia-ecclesia, but at last a monê-ecclesia, and these are at once sequents and opposites. The Church of Jerusalem is both one and the whole;† the Church of the Ephesian and Colossian Epistles is also one and the whole;‡ but the former is single and individual, while the latter is collective and universal. The one is a unit, which difference may break and dissolve; the other a unity, which variety will only help to realise. If the one had attempted to become the only Church, no Church universal would have been possible; it was through the manifold of experience that the higher unity was gained.

It is by Paul that the notion of the monê- as distinguished from the mia-ecclesia is expressed and explicated; it is doubtful if apart from him it have any representative in Apostolic literature.§ He appears as the very spirit of difference and independence, but he is the Apostle of comprehension and unity. While his controversy with the Judaic party is most intense, his relations to the Jewish Church are most brotherly. He recognises a distinction of Christians, both as regards race and place,‖ but he recognises no distinction in brotherhood, and only the more serves where he is the less loved.* In experience the *κοινωνία* was larger than the local *ἐκκλησίαι*, and harmonised their differences,† but in thought the multitude were so combined as to constitute a richer whole. The point where we can best study the relation of the real and ideal, the local and illocal, in the notion of the Church, is where Paul first elaborates the image of the body of Christ.‡ He had first used it of the local Church, as he had before used the images of the tilled field and the temple; § the local was a microcosm, the image and mirror of the universal. The fellowship of the body of Christ suggested the figure of the Church as His body; union in the act of remembrance involved the unity of the united. The unity was, therefore, one of persons; what all received made all who received it one. But did this ideal agree with the reality? In the Corinthian Church there were manifold differences and even divisions, parties were formed, each with a name as a symbol.‖ There had been grave sins, involving serious discipline;¶ disorder had reigned in the assembly, even on the most solemn occasions; ** violent strife had raged as to the *χαρίσματα*.†† The real condition suggested the ideal, and he presented the one as a rebuke and warning to the other. He called upon this much divided society to conceive itself through its ideal. It was a unity, an organism, a body, the body of Christ.‡‡ Its life was one, its parts were many, and the meanest part was as necessary as the noblest, and neither could dispense with the other; the dignity of the whole dignified the least noble part. The essential idea is that Christ is so in all, so needs all, so works through all that He is the life of the body, and the body the realisation of His life. Each is necessary to Him, but He to all. Then Paul looks at the question of difference through the action of God. He has set in the Church apostles, prophets, teachers, and bestowed on it certain *Χαρίσματα*. He has created the differences, but why? With a view to the common good, to the creation of things more excellent than themselves—the love that never faileth, the spirit that induces men to live as if the God who is love were incarnate in the men. The next use of the figure is similar.§§ The many are one body in Christ and severally members one of another, and the difference of gifts is traced to God, each being given in order to the efficiency and unity of the whole. The significant things in both cases are these:—As regards offices the two lists are not identical. Apostles come first in the one list, but do not appear at all in the other; whence it follows that no fixed system of orders was necessary to the body or known to the Church. Further, no member or person appears as possessed of any sacerdotal office or function, either with respect to the body or its activities. Again, the discussion introduces passages that in the enthusiasm of humanity surpass all others in the Pauline writings. The Christ that inhabits the body is the Christ of the Beatitudes and the Beneficences of the Gospels. Sacramental grace is not here, nor the orders that are its channels, nor the organism which defines the sphere of "the covenanted mercies." What we have here is the grace and truth which dwelt in Him become active and efficient in the men who at His call and through love to Him have gathered into Societies, that they may the better, as His incarnated and organised spirit, continue His work among men.

---

* Gal. iii. 26-28. † 2 Cor. ii. 6. ‡ Gal. vi. 1.
§ 1 Cor. v. 3-7. ‖ 2 Cor. iii. 1.
¶ Phil. iv. 15-20; 2 Cor. viii. 1-8; ix. 1, 6-14.
** 2 Cor. viii. 19. †† Acts i. 15-26. ‡‡ vi. 5. §§ xi. 22.
‖‖ xv. 12, 22. ¶¶ ii. 44; iv. 32; vi. 2; xix. 18.
*** Matt. xviii. 15-20.

* 1 Cor. iii. 16.
† Acts v. 11; viii. 1, 3. *Cf.* Gal. i. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 9.
‡ Eph. i. 22; iii 10, 21; Col. i. 18, 24.
§ In Acts the only verse which has it is Pauline, xx. 28. Of course the idea may be found elsewhere, but not under the form of the Church.
‖ 1 Thess. ii. 14; Gal. i. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Rom. xvi. 4.

3. In the later Epistles, this idea is expanded into a sublime universalism, which transcends time as much as space. The thought of the Apostle has risen above its old antitheses, and now contemplates all things through the ideal Christ. In Him, through Him, and for Him were all things created, in Him they are so constituted as to be an order, a system.* As He made, He redeems; His coming is no accident, or after-thought, but as He ever was with the Father, man has for the Father ever been in Him. It is through this new standpoint, and its vaster and more synthetic outlook that the notion of the mystical Church first emerges. It is conceived more as an ideal, yet without ceasing to be real, and is personified in an altogether new way. The Church, personal, yet universal, stands over against the personal yet universal Christ: He is the Husband, it is the wife, He is the Head, it is the body; He exercises authority, it lives in subjection and obedience; He loves the Church, gives Himself for it, sanctifies it, exalts it, makes it beautiful, holy, blameless.† These attributes, the affections exercised and received, the ideal identity and adequacy to each other of the personal Christ and the personalised Church,‡ are new, though it may be only in the sense of being more explicitly developed, elements in the Pauline theology. With the emergence of the new, certain old elements have either retreated into the

---

* 1 Cor. x. 32; xvi. 1–4; 2 Cor. ix. 1 ff.

† Gal. ii. 9.

‡ 1 Cor. x. 17.

§ 1 Cor. iii. 9.

‖ i. 12; iii. 4.

¶ v. 1 ff.

** xi 17 ff.

†† xiv. 26.

‡‡ xii. 12–xiii. 13.

§§ Rom. xii. 4 ff.

* Col. i. 16, 17.

† Eph. v. 23–27.

‡ Eph. v. 28–33.

background or been so qualified as to appear in changed proportions. Christ is not come as the second Adam or new Head of the race, but as the Husband and Head of the Church; He does not die for all, but gives Himself up for the Church, or becomes an offering and a sacrifice to God for us.* Less emphasis falls on the mind and acts of man, more on the will and election of God; instead of the justification by faith and the reconciliation with God of the polemical Epistles, we have the creation of a justified and reconciled humanity, a happy, harmonious, and holy society made after the mind of God, constituted by Christ, filled, guided, united by His Spirit. Unless these new elements and points of view be borne in mind, the Church of the later Epistles cannot be construed. It stands as the symbol of the completed work of Christ, of all that God through it had meant to accomplish; by it was unfolded the mystery of His will; in it was manifested, not simply to earth, but to "principalities and powers in heavenly places," His "manifold wisdom." The attributes and achievements of this Church, then, are so vast that no single institution, or any number of institutions, or even the whole field of human history can exhaust its contents, or be the arena of its full unfolding. It represents the summing up, or bringing to a unity in Christ all things in heaven and upon earth; and is presented under a series of images that strive, as it were, to break the bonds of place and sense and reach immensity. But this "Gloriosissima Civitas Dei" struggles towards eternity through time; the men addressed are members of it; yet, as if to show how the Apostle was possessed with the universalism and the idealisms of the Church, he never once in Ephesians uses the term in its local or realistic sense. Its members are "the called," *i.e.*, they are conceived, not in their temporal, but in their eternal relations; and the notes that ought to distinguish them are "lowliness," "meekness," "forbearance," "long suffering," "love," "unity," "peace,"† social virtues all, not sacerdotal or ecclesiastical. In their collective being they ought to be an ideal society, for they are "one body and one spirit," have one hope, "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all, and in all." The unities are all, as it were, universals, as broad as the sovereignty of God, as penetrative as His ubiquity, as all distributed as His immanence. And in this society every member owes his place and his grace to the gift of Christ, who filleth all in all. And, with reference to the perfecting of His saints, in order to the edifying of His body, He has created agencies—apostles, prophets, pastors, and teachers; but these are persons, not offices; men created of God, not orders instituted of men. And the edification of the body is a growth in love, so toward Christ that the nearer it comes to Him the more He possesses it. Within this Epistle, then, the Church is so conceived that the notes of what is called Catholicism are all absent; the Church, in the degree that it is mystical, knows no special polity, consents to no institutional forms, is distinguished by no offices, and has no single note that can with any veracity of speech be termed sacerdotal. The Church is constituted by God in Christ, and is composed of "the called," "the saints," the men of love and peace. To it no priest is necessary, or his "instruments of grace"; grace is the direct gift of Christ, what fills the body is His Spirit, what moves, unites, and enlarges it is His love.

If we have rightly construed the Church in its later Pauline or mystical sense, we ought to be able to understand its relation to the kingdom. The kingdom is the Church viewed from above; the Church is the kingdom seen from below. In the kingdom the society is conceived through its creative and informing will; in the Church the will is conceived through the created and informed society. In the kingdom the king is emphasised; in the Church the citizens; in the one case we see man as he ought to be before God—poor in spirit, seeking His righteousness, doing His will, humble, teachable, without conventional goodness, good only in spirit and in truth: in the other case we see man as he ought to be for God in society—possessed of social virtues, exercising all the beneficences and charities that redeem and adorn life as man lives it with man. Hence, Jesus preaches the kingdom, *i.e.*, as King declares Himself, proclaims the kingdom constituted by the presence of the King; but the Apostles, by founding Churches edify the Church, call men to become saints, and to enter into the society of the saved. Hence, too, come the very different images under which the two are presented; the kingdom of heaven is as a sower who goeth forth to sow, or like treasure hid in a field, or like a merchantman seeking goodly pearls, or like a net cast into the sea, or like a seed, or like leaven; but the Church is a house, or a temple, or a body, *i.e.*, the kingdom represents the idea of a creative will, and man's relation to it as one of search, or its action in man as one of growth; but the Church represents a structure, the association of once unrelated parts, the organisation or combination of once dead atoms into a living whole. The coincidence of the two ideas is seen here: the plan after which the Church is built is the will of God, or the ideal of the kingdom, while the means by which the kingdom is realised is the Church and the Churches. But this involves the correlation of the two ideas: the kingdom is the immanent Church, and the Church is the explicated kingdom, and nothing alien to either can be in the other. The kingdom is the Church expressed in the terms and mind and person of its Founder; the Church is the kingdom done into living souls and the society they constitute.

---

* Eph. v. 2, 25.

† Eph. iv. 1 ff.

This idea of the Church, as essentially the new humanity, created and penetrated by Christ, as little dependent for its being on specific forms of polity as was the old humanity, might be proved and illustrated from many sides. For example, this idea of the ideal universal Church is exclusively Pauline. In Hebrews, *ἐκκλησία* is used only as in the LXX.;[*] in Peter not at all; in James and John and the Apocalypse only in its local sense. But in its place Hebrews, Peter, and the Apocalypse have the idea of the people; they conceive the new through the old society; the new is a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's people with His law written in their hearts, and all the fleshly sacrifices, official priesthoods, and outer ceremonies of the old abolished by being translated into the spiritual realities they typified. The emphasis, again, falls upon the people; they are a whole before God, needing no officials to constitute their unity, or communicate grace by special instruments of the ancient kind. These writers know nothing of the notion that the Church depends for its being on a special polity; to them such a notion would have seemed like an attempt to change the new law into the old. They would have found all the elements essential to it, all the ideas that most distinguish it—its orders, its authorised channels, its covenanted and uncovenanted mercies, its priestly claims, and its ceremonial sanctities—in the law they had escaped from, whose burdens they and their fathers had been unable to bear. And they would have added, the Church is the people of God; wherever they are He is, and the Church through Him in them; and as God's are a free people, He allows them to organise their own polities, the best polities always being those most deeply rooted in love, and so most creative of the spiritual and redeeming graces.

V.

So much has been said as to the New Testament idea of the Church that we can give but little space to the questions, quite distinct yet related, connected with the organisation and administration of the Churches. Only two points of essential importance to the Anglican theory need be noted—the one concerns the Apostles and the Apostolic Succession, the other the character and function of the Ministry as such. The question connected with the first is this: Did the Apostles constitute and consecrate successors with a view to the transmission of Apostolic authority or powers along given lines to given orders, and to these only? The question connected with the second point is this: Is the New Testament Ministry a priesthood? As to these we cannot so much attempt a discussion as simply state conclusions.

1. There is no doubt that Christ appointed twelve Apostles, that the number twelve bore an ideal significance, and that they had certain specific and defined functions. But that they were to create or did create a special order of successors; that they were empowered to transmit, or did as a matter of fact either profess or endeavour to transmit apostolical authority—are positions, to say the least, quite incapable of historical proof, and to be not proven is, in claims of this sort, to be found not true. The Apostles were preachers of the Kingdom of Heaven, messengers of Christ, witnesses of His resurrection, but ordination is never described either as their special function, or as their peculiar and exclusive practice. The hands laid on Paul were not those of Apostles, but first those of Ananias,[*] a man otherwise absolutely unknown, then those of the prophets and teachers at Antioch,[†] and he throughout strenuously maintained that he was made an Apostle neither from men nor through man.[‡] Barnabas was sent forth, not by the Apostles, but by the Church.[§] But, indeed, what does the term "Apostles" mean? No corporate body, no college of ordaining officers, no exclusive Order, but simply certain persons whose special function was the Ministry of the Word.[‖] Of the men Jesus appointed, James, Peter, and John are the only three

---

[*] Heb. ii. 12; xii. 23. In the latter case the use is figurative but clearly based on O. T.

[*] Acts ix. 10, 17.

[†] Acts xiii. 1-3.

[‡] Gal. i. 1

[§] Acts xi. 22.

[‖] Acts vi. 2, 4.

ever named outside the Gospels,[*] and for the history of the Church and its organisation, only the two latter are of real significance, and even their significance is personal rather than official. James, the Brother of the Lord, appears as an Apostle, though he was not one of the twelve. Paul seems to associate with himself in the Apostleship, Apollos,[†] Timothy, and Silvanus,[‡] and to apply the name to Andronicus and Junia.[§] The Apostles were therefore no fixed Order, and had no special governmental functions, others laid on hands as well as they; they were simply messengers and representatives of Christ. He preached, so did they; by preaching He established His kingdom, and they planted Churches; by the Word they worked their wonders and did their work. But as to transmission of authority there is no word and no evidence of the existence of any body either authorised or able to do it.

2. But the other point is more fundamental. The New Testament ministry is not a priesthood; in no single feature, aspect, or office has it a sacerdotal character. It is a small question what apostle, prophet, teacher, bishop, pastor, presbyter, deacon mean, or how some perished and others survived, and how in the process of survival they were changed; but it is a profounder question, full of vaster issues, how into those that survived the sacerdotal idea penetrated, and by changing them changed the character of the religion through and through. What we have to see is the exact correspondence between the ministerial office and the nature of the religion, or the offices of the Church, and its essential character. Sacerdotalism means that an office is conceived to be so sacrosanct, and so necessary to man's worship of God, and God's access to man, that without it there can be no perfect worship on the one side, and no adequate or regular communication of life on the other. It means that the priest, as a priest, and not as a person, and his instruments as his, or as used by him, are the only authorized and divinely constituted media through which God reaches man and man God, or through which the recognised and approved intercourse of the creature with the Creator can proceed. Now, in the New Testament no such ideas are associated with the ministry, or with any person appointed to it. No man bears the priest's name, or professes his functions; the studious avoidance of the name by men who were steeped in the associations of sacerdotal worship, is most significant; and so is the care with which they translate sacerdotal customs and ideas into their spiritual antitypes. The priesthood ceases to be official by being made universal. The Christian society is a priesthood,[*] and the sacrifices it offers are spiritual,[†] the living man,[‡] the gifts and beneficences which are acceptable to God,[§] and the praise which He loves.[‖] The temple is no longer the building where the priest officiates, conducts his processions, and indulges in his ceremonial, but it is the Man[¶] and the Society.[**] The virtues enjoined are not of the old sacerdotal sort, but ethical, inner, human—faith, hope, love, the obedience that is so pleasing to God because so helpful to man. The life of the communities is not bound by any priestly rules or observances,[††] but by the new laws of love. The Church and its ministry, therefore, correspond throughout; the ministry is one of persuasion, that seeks to move the will through the conscience, and both through the reason and heart; that cares in the new and gracious way of brotherhood for the poor, the sick, the ignorant, the suffering, the sinful, and attempts to help, to love, to win by sweet reasonableness; while the Church is a society which seeks to realise the beautiful ideal of a family of God, or a household of faith, or a brotherhood of man. There is no place for the priest or his office; his sensuous sanctities are unknown, and, instead, there is the kingdom of God, and the endeavour to do His will. The rise of the sacerdotal Orders is a question for later history; it marks a long descent from the Apostolic age, but is certainly no thing of Apostolic descent.

Many questions remain which we dare not here and now attempt to touch. The Church lives, and moves, and has its being in Christ; but the Churches have as conditions of their being what used to be called the pure word of God and the Sacraments. The sentence, "it is impossible to believe in the Bible without believing in the Church, cannot be explicated without becoming either insignificant, irrelevant, or false. But we are strictly within the lines of historical truth when we say that without the Word no Church can come into being, and without it none can continue. Every Apostolic Church was created by the preaching of the word, and lived only as the creative became the preservative agency. As to the Sacraments, we shall only say, once they became the acts and instruments of a priest they lost their original sense, and were changed from the possessions and seals and symbols of the community into the appendices and articles of an office. Enough has been said to indicate how little the Anglo-Catholic polity represents the New Testament Church. Of that Church it is, according to its own claims, either the direct and legitimate descendant, or it is nothing. Compared with its putative source, the contrasts and even contradictions are much more striking than the resemblances, and in the respects and degree in which it differs it does equal injustice to the Christianity of Christ and of His people. The most inveterate schismatic is the person or the party that draws round himself or itself a circle, and says, "within this is the sphere of God's 'covenanted mercies'; all without is the region of the uncovenanted. We are the Catholic Church; all beyond is the province of the Sectaries and the Sects." There is nothing in all history so intensely schismatic as this pseudo-Catholicism; it is the vanity of the Sectary in its worst possible form. And those who believe that the Church of God is as broad and as free as the Mercy of God may well be forgiven if they speak plainly and frankly about any and every attempt to bind it to a provincial polity, and make it seem less large and less gracious than the action of God in history has proved it to be.

---

[*] Of course, Acts i. 1–14 is here regarded as a piece of the Gospel History; it is simply the introduction to the Acts of the Apostles, which really begins with the 15th verse. But *cf.* vi. 2.

[†] 1 Cor. iv. 6, 9. [‡] 1 Thess. ii. 6, 9. [§] Rom. xvi. 7.

[*] Apoc. i. 6; v. 10; xx. 6. [†] 1 Peter ii. 5.
[‡] Rom. xii. 1; Phil. ii. 17. [§] Phil. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 16.
[‖] Heb. xiii. 15. [¶] 1 Cor. vi. 19. [**] 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17.
[††] Gal. iv. 9, 10; Col. ii. 16–23.

A. M. Fairbairn.

A good story is told of Dr. Jowett, the eminent Oxford scholar. His study windows look into the "Broad" at Oxford; and, as everybody knows, he is always at work among his books. Coming with his party—chiefly American tourists—under these windows, the local guide began: "This, ladies and gentlemen, is Baliol College, one of the very oldest in the university, and famous for the heredition of its scholars. The 'ead of Baliol College is called the master. The present master of Baliol is the celebrated Professor Benjamin Jowett, *Regius* Professor of Greek. Those are Professor Benjamin Jowett's study windows; and there"—here the man stooped down, took up a handful of gravel and threw it up against the panes, bringing the poor professor to the window—"ladies and gentlemen, is Professor Benjamin Jowett himself."

PROFESSOR BRIGGS AND HIS CRITICS.

[The Rev. Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D., at his inauguration as Professor of Biblical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, delivered an address on "The Authority of the Scriptures" that has been the subject of much and varied comment, public and private. We give herewith a syllabus of the lecture given out by his authority to the press, and therefore accurately representing his views, together with comments by some representative newspapers.—Ed.]

THE SYLLABUS.

"Human nature is so constituted that when self-consciousness and reflection rise into activity, there is an irresistible impulse to seek authority for the relations in which we find ourselves, the knowledge that is taught us and the conduct prescribed to us in life. If we undertake to search the forms of authority that exist about us, they all alike disclose themselves as human and imperfect, and we feel at times as if we were upon an unknown sea with pilots and officers in whom we have no confidence.

"I. Divine authority is the only authority to which man can yield implicit obedience. There are historically three great fountains of divine authority: 1. The Bible. 2. The Church. 3. The Reason.

"1. The majority of Christians from the apostolic age have found God through the Church. Martyrs and saints, fathers and schoolmen, the profoundest intellects and the saintliest lives have had this experience. Institutional Christianity has been to them the presence chamber of God. If we have not seen God in institutional Christianity it is because the Church and its institutions have enveloped themselves with human conceits and follies, have encased the divine authority in the authority of popes and councils, prelates, priests and theologians, and these mediators of redemption have obtruded themselves in the way of devout seekers after God.

"2. Another means used by God to make himself known is the forms of reason, the metaphysical categories, and conscience, and the religious feeling. Here in the Holy of Holies of the human nature, God presents himself to those who seek him. There are those who would refuse rationalists a place in the company of the faithful. But they forget that the essential thing is to find God; and if these men have found God without the mediation of the Church and the Bible, Church and Bible are means not ends, they are avenues to God, not God.

We regret that these rationalists depreciate the means of grace, so essential to most of us, but we are warned lest we commit the same error and depreciate Reason and the Christian Consciousness.

"3. Protestant Christianity builds its life and faith on the divine authority contained in the Scriptures and too often depreciates the Church and the Reason. Men are influenced by their temperaments and environments, which of the three ways of access to God they pursue. There are obstructions thrown up by the follies of men in each one of these avenues, and it is our duty as servants of the living God, to remove the stumbling-blocks out of the way.

"II. Barriers. No one of these ways has been so obstructed as the Holy Bible. The ancient Jews made a fence about the Law, and enclosed it with circle upon circle of traditional interpretation. The Christian Church concealed the Word of God behind the authority of popes and councils, fathers and schoolmen. The scholastics and ecclesiastics of Protestantism enveloped the Bible with creeds, ecclesiastical decisions and dogmatic systems. The Bible has been treated as if it were a baby, to be wrapped in swaddling-clothes, nursed, and carefully guarded lest it should be injured by heretics and sceptics. It has been shut up in a fortress and surrounded by breastworks and fortifications as extensive as those that envelop Cologne and Strasburg. This is the way men have been dealing with the Bible, shutting out the light of God, obstructing the life of God and fencing in the authority of God.

"1. Superstition. We are accustomed to attach superstition to Roman Catholic Mariolatry, Hagiolatry, and the use of images, pictures and other external things in worship. But superstition is no less superstition if it take the form of Bibliolatry. It may be all the worse if it concentrate itself upon this one thing.

"2. Verbal Inspiration. There is nothing divine in the text, in its letters, words or clauses. The divine authority is not in the style or in the words, but in the concept, and so the divine power of the Bible may be transferred into any language. It may speak as powerfully in English as in Greek, in Choctaw as in Aramaic, in Chinese as in Hebrew. We force our way through the language and the letters, the grammar and the style, to the inner substance of the thought, for there, if at all, we shall find God.

"3. Authenticity. Many theologians have insisted that we must prove that the Scriptures were written by or under the superintendence of prophets and apostles. Abandoning the authority of institutional Christianity they have sought a prop in floating traditions. These traditions assign authors to all the books of the Bible, and on the authority of these human authors, it is claimed that the Bible is divine. These theologians seem altogether unconscious of the circle of reasoning they are making. The only way we can prove the authority of the authors is by their writings, and yet we are asked to accept the authority of the writings on the authority of the authors. The great mass of the Old Testament was written by authors whose names or connection with their writings are lost in oblivion. If this is destroying the Bible, the Bible is destroyed already. But who tells us that these traditional names were the authors of the Bible? The Bible itself? The creeds of the Church? Any reliable testimony? None of these. Pure conjectural tradition! Nothing more. Higher Criticism has not contravened any decision of any Christian council or any creed of the Church or any statement of Scripture itself. It has rather brought a long-neglected statement of the Westminster Confession into prominence: 'The authority of the Holy Scripture for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God, the author thereof.'

"4. Inerrancy. This barrier confronts historical criticism. There are errors in the Scriptures which no one has been able to explain away, and the theory that they were not in the original text is sheer assumption upon which no mind can rest with certainty. The Bible itself nowhere makes this claim. The creeds of the Church nowhere sanction it. It is a ghost of modern evangelicanism to frighten children. The Bible has maintained its authority with the best scholars of our time, who, with open minds, have been ready to recognize any error that might be pointed out by historical criticism; for these errors are all in the circumstantials and not in the essentials. It is unwise and unchristian to force men to accept the divine authority of the Bible or reject it on the question of its inerrancy in these circumstantials.

"5. Violations of the Laws of Nature. It is claimed that the miracles disturb or violate the laws of nature, and the harmony of the universe; and so the miracles of the Bible have become, to men of science, sufficient evidence that the Bible is no more than other sacred books. Biblical writers do not lay so much stress upon them as modern apologists. Moses and Jesus both warned their disciples against miracles that would be wrought in interests of false prophets and false Messiahs. The tests that they give to discriminate the true and the false were not their marvellous character, their violation of the laws of nature, their suspension of the uniformity of law, or the comprehension of extraordinary laws with ordinary in higher laws; nothing of the kind, but the simple test whether they set forth the holy character, and the gracious teaching of God and his Messiah. The miracles of the Bible are miracles of redemption.

"6. Minute Prediction. Another barrier to the Bible has been the interpretation put upon predictive prophecy, making it a sort of history before the time, and looking anxiously for the fulfilment of the details of Biblical prediction. See Jonah going to Nineveh with the prediction that in forty days Nineveh will be destroyed, and then going to a safe place outside the city, waiting with impatience for the grand sight, the destruction of the metropolis of the world. But Nineveh repents, God recalls his decree, and the city is spared. This is not the only unfulfilled prediction in the Old Testament. God has recalled more than one of his messages of woe. He postpones judgment till men count him slack in the fulfilment of his promises, and mock and jeer at his justice. This makes it difficult for a hard and fast system of dogma. It troubles the apologist and disarranges his lines of defence, but it presents God himself as the God of man, the very God that humanity craves.

"We have passed through these barriers that men have thrown up in front of the Word of God, the breastworks against philosophy, history and science. It is not surprising that multitudes of the best men of our time have rejected the Bible thus guarded and defended, as if it could not sustain the light of day.

"III. Theology of the Bible. Here, if anywhere, divine authority will be found.

"1. The most prominent feature of the religion of the Bible is Theophany. When the doctrine of divine transcendence was unduly emphasized the theophanies remained in obscurity behind the miracle, and the prediction that might be wrought by the power of God from a distance, outside of his universe, but now that the immanence of God is rising into prominence the theophany casts the miracle and the prediction into its shadow. If God is really present in his world, and has an interest in the bearers of redemption to a chosen people, the kingdom of priests for mankind, is it not reasonable that he should show his form in the midst of the elements of nature and his countenance in the faces of intelligent beings?

"2. The institutions of the Old Testament religion are of a most elaborate character. These, doubtless, belong to the region of external religion, and to a lower stage in the religious training of man. The Old Testament prophets knew as well as we that they were forms, invalid without holy contents of grace. This magnificent religious system is pure and holy throughout. A holy God can only be worshipped by a holy people and in ceremonies of holiness. They point forward as by myriad flames of light to the Messiah who absorbs them in the sunshine of his presence. They become for all ages and for all men the appropriate symbols of the universal religion.

"3. The God of the Bible is one God. He is spirit, who transcends the universe that he created, governs and directs it to its appointed end, but he is immanent in his universe, inhabiting it and by his energy shaping all its forces. He is a person, bearing proper names. He is the living God, the fountain of every life and activity, living in all life, moving in all motion. The being of God in the Bible is high above the best attainments of philosophical theism, and the most skilful constructions of the systematic theologian. When we turn from the best of them to the God of the Bible it is like rising from earth to heaven.

"4. The favorite divine attribute of the Old Testament and the New is the attribute of mercy—that is the theme upon which historians and prophets, singers and sages alike delight to dwell. It is hard for the Jew or the Christian to understand. It transcends human experience. It seems so improbable even for God, that men must be explaining it away. The love of God as taught in the Old Testament transcends human powers of conception. None could have taught such love who had not seen the loving countenance of God and experienced the pulsation of that love in their own hearts. The love of God to the world is more important than all the systems devised by men. It will shine forever as the central sun of the universe when all the creeds and theologies have been buried in the oblivion of the eternities.

"5. The doctrine of man in the Bible is divine doctrine. A twin mirror shows man what he is in sin and misery, and what he is to be in holiness and happiness. The Bible presents sinful man in the midst of an original innocency and an ultimate perfection. Sin is only a temporary condition. The original man was innocent and sinless, but not possessed of that righteous and moral excellence that comes only by discipline and heavenly training. The temptation was a necessary means of grace. Man did not make his religious progress in the straight line of faith and obedience, but in the curved line of sin and redemption. The Bible tells us of a race origin, a race sin, a race ideal, a race redeemer, and a race redemption.

"6. Redemption is born of the love of God. It aims at the transformation of the sinful and suffering race of man into the image of God. The history of the world is the divine discipline of mankind. (*a*) The redemption taught in the Bible aims to remove all the ills that flesh is heir to. There can be no Darkest Africa or Darkest London which the Light of Redemption may not illuminate. We dishonor the God of the Bible and are stumbling-blocks in the way of multitudes, obstructing their way to God and their entrance into the kingdom of heaven, if we do not with all our souls strive to relieve their misery and want. (*b*) The Redemption of the Bible comprehends the whole process of grace. The Bible rises high above the faults of modern theology, and comprehends in its redemption of man his justification, sanctification and glorification, his regeneration, his renovation and his transformation, his faith, his repentance and his holy love. (*c*) Another fault of Protestant theology is in its limitation of redemption to this world. The modern reaction against this limitation in the theory of second probation is not surprising. I do not find this doctrine in the Bible, but I do find the doctrine of the middle state of conscious higher life in the communion with Christ and with multitudes of the departed; and of the necessity of entire sanctification in order that the work of redemption may be completed. Progressive sanctification after death is the doctrine of the Bible and the Church. The bugbear of a judgment immediately after death and of a magical transformation in the dying hour should be banished from the world, and we should look with hope and joy for the continuance of the process of grace and the wonders of redemption in the company of the blessed to which we are all hastening. (*d*) The Biblical redemption is a redemption of our race. Loving only the elect is earthly, human teaching, but electing men to salvation by the touch of divine love, that is heavenly doctrine. The Bible does not teach universal salvation, but it does teach the salvation of the world, of the race of man; and that cannot be accomplished by the selection of a limited number from the mass.

"7. There is ample room for criticism in the ethical precepts and in the conduct of the holy men of the Bible. Doubtless it is true that we would not receive such men into our families, if they lived among us, and did such things now as they did then. But they do not live now; they lived in an early age of the world, when the divine exposition of sin was not so searching and the divine law of righteousness was not so evident. We must look more at their saintly characters that have given them their place among the heroes of the faithful. I fear that the Christian Church does not present any better history than the people of Israel in the olden time. If Israel did not live up to the ethical principles of Moses and the Prophets—have we lived up to the ethics of Jesus and his apostles? It is a very significant fact that the wisdom literature of the Old Testament, which is essentially ethical, has been neglected by the theologians. But the greatest sin against the Bible has been the neglect of the ethics of Jesus. Tolstoi says that Christians think that Jesus did not mean what he said. Tolstoi's criticism is severe, but is it not just? If we really believed that Jesus meant what he said, how could we live such selfish lives? It is my opinion that if the grace of God should so impel a man that he could be transformed into the image of the holy Jesus, the cry would resound through the streets of New York: 'Crucify him! Crucify him!'

"8. The Messiah is the culmination of the Old Testament. He is the pivot of history. All through these nineteen centuries Christians have been learning from their Lord, and yet how little do we know of him! The Christ of the Bible will exert a much greater power upon the coming generations when they grasp the full Biblical doctrine and cease expending their strength and exhausting their energy in the speculative elaboration of some few of its phases. In all departments of Biblical theology there is new life and new doctrine and new morals for the Church of God. More light is about to break forth from the Holy Scriptures upon the Christian world.

"IV. Harmony of the Sources of Authority. I must now ask you to go back with me and use the advantages we have gained for a brief review of those other seats of divine authority—the Church and the Reason. If God really speaks to men in these three centres there ought to be no contradiction between them. It is my profound conviction that we are on the threshold of a happy reconciliation. Removing the obstructions erected by well-meaning but misguided men from the Bible, the Church and the Reason, they are, they always have been and always will be harmonious. The Bible needs the Church and the Reason ere it can exert its full power upon the life of men. Institutional Christianity was established by Christ, and his apostles and no one can safely ignore it. The Church unites with the Bible in giving us the assurance of God's presence and authority throughout history, and of his gracious help in the present. The neglect of the Church as a means of grace retards the rise of the Bible itself as a means of grace, and dulls our sensitiveness to the presence of God. The Reason also has its rights—its place and importance in the economy of redemption. I rejoice at the age of rationalism, with all its wonderful achievements in philosophy. I look upon it as preparing men to use their reasons in the last great age of the world. It is impossible that the Bible and the Church should ever exert their full power until the human reason, trained and strained to the utmost, rise to the heights of its energies and reach forth after God and his Christ. Let us remove every encumbrance out of the way for a new life; the life of God is moving throughout Christendom; the springtime of a new age is about to come upon us.

Comments of the Press.

From *The Christian Union* (Evangelical), January 29, 1891.

Tuesday evening, January 20, Professor Charles A. Briggs was installed in the Chair of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, to which he has been transferred from the Chair of Hebrew. The new professorship is fully endowed, and in it the opportunity to present to the students his views respecting the structure, origin, and authority of the Bible will be much larger. These topics, which have been only incidentally treated in the teaching of the Hebrew language, will be of the very essence of his new professorship. This is the answer which Union Theological Seminary makes to the attacks which have been made upon it, and upon Professor Briggs, by those who would deny in the realm of theology that freedom of investigation and discussion which is freely awarded in every other department of science. It would seem that the modern Torquemada, instead of burning the heretics in an *auto da fé*, is permitted only to light the furnace which makes the heretic's nest more warm and comfortable.

Professor Briggs's inaugural address (an abstract of which will be found in another column) will disappoint his enemies and delight his friends. It is indeed both radical and progressive, but it is so only that it may be conservative by being constructive. Three conflicting schools of thought give apparently antagonistic answers to the question, What is the seat of authority in religion? Professor Briggs undertakes to harmonize these conflicting schools in the only way in which permanent harmony in such cases can be secured, by showing beneath each of these systems the profound principle in which all are essentially agreed. The only real authority, says Professor Briggs, is God. There are three methods by which we have access to the thought and will of God—the Scriptures, the Church, the Reason. Protestantism has erred by shutting itself out from the Church and the Reason as means of access to God; Romanism, by shutting itself out from the Bible and from the Reason; the Rationalist, by shutting himself out from the Bible and the Church. The truly devout student, who recognizes authority only in God, will accept all these ways of access to God, and will use alike the Scriptures, the consensus of the Catholic Church, and his own individual reason, in acquainting himself with the thought and will of God.

This is an admirable statement of the goal towards which the separate but converging lines of thought are tending. It is conservative as well as constructive. Let no one fear lest such a view will lessen the authority of the Scripture, and so weaken the Christian faith. It may abbreviate our creeds, but it will only be as the gardener prunes off the woody growths of the vine, to throw more sap into the fruit-bearing branches. The abbreviated belief will be a more impregnable conviction. If our creed rests upon the hypothesis that all the books of the Bible were inspired by God, and are without error in any part of them—and that rests upon the further hypothesis that they were written by the authors whose names tradition has given to us, and that upon the further hypothesis that these authors were amanuenses, who took down, as by dictation, word by word, what God gave to them—the whole Christian faith will depend upon a very uncertain foundation. If, on the other hand, our Christian faith is composed of those elements which are embodied in various literary forms in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, which are confirmed by the common experience of the noblest and the most godly—that is, of the Christian Church—and which are able to challenge the keenest cross-examination of the Reason, and to endure it, the faith so built will be founded indeed upon a rock, from which no floods of skeptical philosophy or criticism can disturb it. If one asks which of these three sources of knowledge respecting the divine will and thought is supreme and authoritative over the others, the answer will be, neither ; they are concurrent witnesses. There are three that bear witness on earth, and these three are one.

If Professor Briggs had rendered the Church no other service, there would be reason for gratitude to him for so clear a statement of the sources of our Christian faith.

Those who, like ourselves, rejoice in the witness which Union Theological Seminary has borne to catholicity and liberty will be glad to know that, by their presence, some of the most eminent theologians in different denominations expressed their approval of the appointment and inauguration of Professor Briggs, an approval vigorously expressed in a congratulatory letter from Bishop Henry C. Potter, who could not be present in person.

From *The Observer* (Evangelical), February 12, 1891.

Dr. Briggs's late inaugural address contained nothing novel in itself or novel as coming from him. It was the occasion alone which made his views of any special interest. As long as his ideas in regard to the character of the Scriptures, the nature of the Church, the office of reason and related subjects, were questions in controversy between his own communion and those with totally different affinities, they were interesting to comparatively few. But when his introduction to a new professorship became the exaltation of these views as a leading feature in the teaching of a Presbyterian Theological school, they had a totally different position and interest. Thousands of persons, within and without the Presbyterian Church, have been exercised to learn whether these teachings are consistent with the confessions and standards of the Church itself, whether they are in harmony with the teachings of those in whom they have the greatest confidence as spiritual fathers, whether they are helpful to those who seek to make the most of the simplest elements of gospel truth, or whether on the contrary they are a conspicuous part of "the down grade," by which churches, theological schools and communities have descended into the cheerless region of agnosticism or unbelief. It is superfluous to repeat here the positions taken by Dr. Briggs, and they are mentioned merely for the sake of calling attention to their character and drift. Whatever is said by any one in their defence as consistent with the testimony of the Presbyterian Church, every one observes that they are hailed with acclamations of approval by those who are openly antagonistic to that testimony. Now, it is inexplicable that a Presbyterian theological professor should be faithful to Presbyterian standards and at the same time be warmly applauded by those who have no sympathy with those standards, and who are actively engaged in espousing different views. For instance, we find that *The Christian Union*, whose position on all these controverted points is familiar to the religious public, and which has become the exponent and defender of one and another phase of the new theology, welcomes Dr. Briggs's address as "both radical and progressive, but it is only so that it may be conservative by being constructive." In its sincere gratification with its entire tone and tendency, it rejoices in the "freedom of investigation and discussion" that is the boon of the modern Presbyterian theological professor. He has nothing to dread from the narrow-minded, bigoted heresy hunter. On the contrary, says the paper quoted, "It would seem that the modern Torquemada, instead of burning the heretics in an *auto da fé*, is permitted only to light the furnace which makes the heretic's nest more warm and comfortable."

So swift and powerful is the current of "advanced religious thought" relating to the Scriptures, the future state, the claims of reason in the sphere of faith, and other kindred matters, that the theological teacher of the present is a law unto himself, unless as it is at Andover, he can have his positions reviewed and judged occasionally by the civil courts. Presbyteries, Synods, General Assemblies, Boards of Directors, and all other authorities have no thirst for battle, offensive or defensive. Eccentricity of teaching, that shocks the "conventional" views of pious but ignorant souls, at the same time wins a degree of popular favor that really makes the teacher's nest "more warm and comfortable." Meanwhile the plain people, the plain students and the plain teachers of the old ways of teaching the Word of God and the Gospel of Christ can and need do nothing but be faithful in their own line of work. To their own Master they stand or fall. They have a right to say what they think of these notions, that are new and strange in the highest places of their own Church, that are old and familiar in the highest places of those who have always antagonized the Reformed faith.

By the multiplication of Presbyterian professorships of the type represented by Dr. Briggs, it is possible that in the course of another generation, the mind of that Church may become reconciled to the Bible as expurgated and explained by scientific criticism. Meanwhile there will be an occasional outbreak of the old spirit, such as is expressed in the following letter from an active Christian lawyer whose words convey some of the impressions made upon the minds of great numbers who have read outlines of Dr. Briggs's inaugural :

"Can the Presbyterian Church, which believes in the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and which believes that 'in them ye have eternal life,' allow a professor in one of its theological seminaries to teach that there is not only one fountain of divine authority, to wit, the Bible, but two others, to wit, 'the Church and the Reason.' Who before Dr. Briggs uttered it, ever heard a minister of the Presbyterian Church speak of the 'Holy of Holies of the human nature?' Can there be such a thing or condition? St. Paul says—and he probably knew as much as Dr. Briggs does—'The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him ; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.' That rationalists can find God without the knowledge of Christ, may be 'higher criticism,' but it seems more like heresy, 'for there is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved,' and 'God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him, must worship Him in spirit, and in truth.'

"The attack made by Dr. Briggs upon the authenticity of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and his allegation in relation to the errors therein contained, could not have been more bitter if they had been made by an avowed infidel. By what authority has a minister of the Gospel of Christ and a professor in a theological seminary of the Presbyterian Church a right to say 'the great mass of the Old Testament was written by authors, whose names, or connection with their writings, are lost in oblivion?'

"Our Saviour, when on earth, found no fault with the Scriptures of the Old Testament, nor with the authors thereof, and he surely knew as much as Dr. Briggs does, even if St. Paul did not. Christ explained the Scriptures of the Old Testament to his disciples, and referred to them again and again in his teachings. He and his disciples accepted the writings of the Old Testament with the faith of little children, and without finding fault with them, and for a professor in a seminary of the Presbyterian Church to stir up doubts concerning those things which he admits are 'lost in oblivion,' can hardly be called following in the footsteps of the Master.

"Dr. Briggs may also teach that 'sin is a temporary condition,' but, all the same, the Holy Scriptures teach that 'sin entered into the world, and death by sin,' and there is nothing said in the Bible about sin and death being temporary conditions. It was by Adam's fall that sin entered into the world, and it was by Jesus Christ that those who believe are restored to life. There is no foundation in the Bible for Dr. Briggs's theory of the future state, but, nevertheless, he advocates the idea as a part of a course on Biblical Theology, in a Presbyterian seminary.

"And finally, Dr. Briggs holds that the doctrine of election as now held by the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, is of earthly origin and false, and yet he well knows the sentiment of the vast majority of those holding to the faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States on this subject.

"Whatever action the directors of the Union Theological Seminary may take since Dr. Briggs has made this clear and unequivocal statement of his ideas and beliefs, upon the authority of the Scriptures, the Presbytery of New York should take some action in the matter, and the members of the next General Assembly of our Church should certainly be prepared to reject him when his confirmation as a professor in the Union Theological Seminary comes before that body."

We do not attempt to answer the various queries of the respected gentleman who thus writes. He is evidently a vigorous specimen of the "modern Torquemada," who, according to *The Christian Union*, "is permitted only to light the furnace which makes the heretic's nest more warm and comfortable." This being the case, there is no ground whatever for any bitterness in these controversies as to what is right and honorable in offices of religious trust. When John Horne Tooke was asked how much treason a man could write in England without being hung, he replied that he did not know, but that he was making the experiment. No one who knows Dr. Briggs imagines that he is making a similar experiment as a candidate for the ecclesiastical inquisition, but thousands who do not know him except by his public utterances, regard him as a defender of the faith who is far more dangerous than the ordinary enemy.

From *The Examiner* (Baptist), February 5, 1891.

THE inaugural address of Professor Charles A. Briggs, D.D., on his induction into the new chair of Biblical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary of this city, is an event of more than usual interest and importance. Its significance is increased by the fact that the speaker officially represents the largest and wealthiest theological institution of one of the most orthodox and conservative religious bodies in our land. No one can say that the author used language to conceal his thought. Whatever faults the address may have, to it one must concede the great merit of courage. When it is published in full Professor Briggs might appropriately place on the title-page the famous saying of Danton, *Il nous faut de l'audace, et encore de l'audace, et toujours de l'audace*—We need boldness, and again boldness, and ever boldness.

Dr. Briggs holds that divine authority is made known to man through the Bible, the church, and the reason. If these were not represented by him as of equal and coördinate value, all the published reports do him an injustice. He arraigned Protestantism for its error in rejecting the church and the reason as vehicles of the divine authority, and for its "bibliolatry." It will occur to most Christians that a divine authority conveyed to man through the church and the reason is so vague and uncertain as to be virtually no authority at all. Historically, "the church" is a succession of inconsistent doctrines and practices, from whose conflict no valid conclusion emerges. "Reason" is equally contradictory, what is the highest reason to one age becoming the baldest absurdity of the next. If supreme divine authority is not lodged in the Scriptures, if they do not furnish a rule of faith and practice at once sufficient and infallible, there is no divine authority to which certain appeal may be made. To admit the value of institutional Christianity and of reason in the interpretation of the Scriptures, as all Christians do, is a very different thing from saying with Professor Briggs that divine authority is lodged in either.

The Professor then goes on to consider the barriers that have been erected by a false orthodoxy about the Bible. Much of what he says is now among the commonplaces of Biblical criticism. This cannot be affirmed, however, of his remarks on the "inerrancy" of the Bible. He holds that there are errors in the Scriptures which no one has been able to explain away; that the Bible nowhere makes the claim of inerrancy, and the creeds of the church nowhere sanction it; that it is a ghost of modern evangelicalism to frighten children; that it is unwise and unchristian to force men to accept or reject the divine authority of the Bible on the question of its accuracy in matters that concern the circumstantials and not the essentials. This view of the Bible he believes to be more truly orthodox than the view generally called orthodox—more in accordance with the Scriptures themselves, and with the historic creeds, including the Westminster.

A question of no little interest raised by this inaugural is this: Will the Presbyterian Church hear this bold challenge of its cherished doctrines, uttered from the chair of its most famous seminary, and decline to accept it? Never was the gauntlet thrown with more audacity and assurance. Whatever may be the true interpretation of the Bible and of the Westminster Confession, this at least is a fact, the Presbyterian Church of the United States interprets both in a very different way from Professor Briggs. Perhaps they are in error; perhaps he will bring the whole church to his way of thinking. If not, will he be permitted to teach his views without protest or hindrance? It is no concern of Baptists, yet we cannot help taking a certain interest in these questions and their probable answers.

From *The Independent* (Evangelical), January 29, 1891.

THE Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., who is a Presbyterian clergyman and a member of the Presbytery of New York City, was, last week, inaugurated as the Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary of this city, being transferred from the chair of Hebrew. After making the necessary subscription regarding his belief in the Bible, the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Presbyterian Form of Government, and receiving the formal charge from Dr. Frazer, he delivered an inaugural address, selecting "the Authority of the Scriptures" as the theme thereof. The Confession of Faith. to which he subscribed, specifies the several books composing "the Holy Scriptures," commonly called the Bible, and in regard to them says: "All which are given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life." The Larger Westminster Catechism declares these Scriptures to be "the Word of God," and "the only rule of faith and obedience."

This professorship in that seminary is a new one, recently founded and endowed by the generosity of the venerable Charles Butler of this city, and by its special title designed to perpetuate the memory of an honored name. "Biblical Theology"—by which we understand theology directly derived from the Bible, resting upon it, proved by it, and accepted because there taught—is the descriptive title of this professorship. The great work to be done by it is not apologetic or polemical as against infidelity, but rather critical and exegetical in an earnest effort to find out what the Bible does teach, and to convey that teaching to young men who are in process of preparation for the Gospel ministry. We can conceive of no better service to the Church and the world than that rendered by such theology if faithfully taught, and of no professorship more important than the one upon which Dr. Briggs has just entered. We have long been of the opinion that this kind of theology, rather than human speculations, or even the dogmas of mere Church creeds as such, is just what the Church most needs to settle and guide its faith, to inspire its hopes, and stimulate its efforts. The more of it the better, and the more thoroughly it is taught, alike in the pulpit and the theological seminary, the better for the spiritual interests of men. No minister is fitted for his work without it. The religion which the Christian pulpit is to teach as "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," is to be found in a *book*, and not elsewhere, except as that book authenticates it; and this book is the Bible itself, as the supreme and final rule in all matters of religious faith and practice. The Bible, among Protestants at least, is recognized as the supreme law of the Church; and it is so regarded because it is by them accepted as the *inspired* Word of God. They believe in its authority to govern their faith, because they believe in its inspiration. This makes it the Word of God, as distinguished from the word of man.

We are hence heartily glad that a professorship of Biblical Theology, pure and simple, has been established in the Union Theological Seminary of this city. One of the greatest wants of the Christian ministry is a thorough biblical scholarship; and every theological institution should be so equipped as to supply this want. Dr. Briggs, the first incumbent of this new professorship, is acknowledged to be a scholar of a high order; and the duties upon which he has just entered afford him a splendid opportunity to do a good work for God and man. What his career in this position is to be is a question for the future to determine. We have endeavored candidly to read the authorized syllabus of his inaugural address; and if we judge by its general tone and character, and also by several of its special utterances, we say in all frankness that the suggested future may well excite the anxiety of considerate and thoughtful Christians. Dr. Briggs is reported as saying that "the Bible is no better than a mass-book for stopping a bullet, and is not as good as holy water for putting out a fire." This is flippant and pithy, with a streak of wit in it; yet to drag the Bible into the business of cracking jokes is a sort of rhetoric for which we have no relish, and with which we do not know how to be amused. We believe in the "Bibliolatry" that makes the Bible to thought and feeling just what Paul called it in his Second Epistle to Timothy—"the Holy Scriptures."

The general type and drift of this address, taken as a whole, seem to us as calculated to shed more darkness than light, and raise more difficulties than it removes, and better adapted to suggest doubts than it is to establish and confirm faith, and, hence, to deepen rather than to clear up the fog on the subject of religion. Dr. Briggs appears more anxious to put "the Bible" on good terms with "the reason" than he is to put "the reason" on good terms with "the Bible"; and if we do not mistake the workings of his mind he regards "the reason" as the *fixed* point, the solid rock of truth, to which "the Bible" must be adjusted at all hazards, and by all necessary modifications of faith. Now as between "the Bible" on the one hand and "the reason" or "the Church" on the other hand, in a case of alleged conflict touching a matter in respect to which both profess to speak, we propose to bow to the authority of "the Bible," and do what we can to persuade others to follow the example. We remember that "the reason" notoriously has its prejudices, its depravities, its crude processes, its hasty assumptions, its self-conceits, its numerous conflicts with itself, and also its fixed limitations; and we are in no hurry to modify our faith in "the Bible" or change our interpretation thereof, for the sake of accommodating it to "the reason."

The inspiration of the Bible, according to Dr. Briggs, does not relate to the language used, but simply to what he calls "the concept," by which, as we suppose, he means the contents or ideas, as distinguished from the language. How are we to get at this "concept," except through the language which encloses and conveys it? And if the language be without any divine guidance in its use, and especially if the Bible contains errors, as Dr. Briggs says that it does, how shall we know when we have actually found "the concept" that God did inspire, and to which he has thus annexed his authority? Here is a question which he does not answer, and which no one can answer who excludes the inspiration of the Holy Ghost from the words used. This certainly is not the inspiration of the day of Pentecost when the persons inspired *spake* "as the Spirit gave them *utterance*," or that which Paul claimed for himself when declaring that he spoke "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth," or that referred to by Peter when he said that "holy men of God *spake* as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." We do not think that Dr. Briggs correctly represents the Bible idea of inspiration. He seems to us so afraid of "verbal inspiration," that he leaves but little chance for any inspiration that humanity can apprehend and apply, especially when we add his admission of various errors, not simply in copies and translations of the Bible, but in the original text itself.

Dr. Briggs, toward the close of his address, speaks of the doctrine of an individual judgment "immediately after death," which has so long been the general faith of Christians, as a "bugbear" which, in his judgment, "should be banished from the world," and seems to hold a doctrine in regard to "the middle state" between death and the resurrection that continues the processes of redemption in that state, and thus naturally involves what is called "a second probation." He says that while "the Bible does not teach universal salvation," it "does teach the salvation of the world, of the race of man; and that cannot be accomplished by the salvation of a limited number from the mass." This is so near a self-contradiction, that we find it difficult to understand just what he intends here to affirm, or what he intends to deny. He at least suggests a second probation added to the one of this life in which by a process of "progressive sanctification" all men will at last be sanctified and saved. It is hardly necessary to say that this does not correspond with the Westminster Confession of Faith; and we are quite sure that it is not according to the plain teaching of the Bible.

We might add comments in respect to what Dr. Briggs says in regard to "authenticity," "inerrancy," "miracles," and "predictive prophecy." But we forbear. What we have said has been said in sorrow, and with much regret, and from a simple sense of duty. We do not think the address fitted to the theme or the occasion, or adapted to do a good service in the interests of Biblical Theology, and have felt constrained to put on record our objections thereto. That sort of "Higher Criticism" which accepts, as true, what it finds in the Bible, not because it finds it there, but because it is true, and hence rejects what in its judgment is not true, even if there found, logically undermines the very foundation of a *supernatural* revelation from God, such as the Bible purports to be, and as we believe it to be. We believe the Bible to be "the Word of God" in the sense of a supernatural inspiration, and hence believe that when the meaning of its language is ascertained, the absolute law of faith is supplied touching all matters embraced therein. If this be "Bibliolatry," then so be it. It is just the kind of "Bibliolatry" which Christ and His Apostles clearly had in respect to the Old Testament Scriptures.

I PRAY you, with all earnestness, to prove and know within your hearts that all things loving and righteous are possible for those who believe in their possibility, and who determine that, for their part, they will make every day's work contribute to them.—*Ruskin.*

FLATTERY is one thing, and praise is another. There is too much of the former in the world, and too little of the latter. Too often we do not praise our friends till they die. It would be better to use this instrument to brighten their lives. Children especially are susceptible to the influence of praise, and those parents and teachers are wise who make a judicious use of it.—*United Presbyterian.*

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

IN DARKEST ENGLAND AND THE WAY OUT. By GENERAL BOOTH. London. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1890. 8vo, $1.50. Paper, 50 cents.

General Booth's "scheme" divides itself into two parts—a plan for rescuing the unemployed and a partial substitute for the present Poor Law and charity methods of administration. It is proposed in this article to criticise only the first part, which consists of:

1. In the establishment of numbers of shelters and factories in the large cities and towns of England, where all who apply shall be received and put to work, and which shall be "used as stepping-stones to help the tramp back into the regular ranks of labor."

2. In the purchase of large tracts of land to form farm colonies, upon which shall be settled those men and women for whom regular work cannot be found, and who shall there be trained to fit them for agricultural work in England, or in the

3. Over-sea-colony, which is to be the third link in General Booth's plan of rescue. This is a very bare sketch of his plan, but must suffice.

What strikes one very forcibly upon first reading this remarkable book is that the author is, or appears to be, quite ignorant of the history of pauperism and crime, and of the measures which for years have been taken for their cure and prevention. He is appalled at the existing horrors and suffering, but he does not know whether the evils he deplores are increasing or diminishing. In relation to crime and the English prison system, and the work for discharged prisoners, he even entirely misrepresents the facts. He describes the present English system as it might have been described one hundred and twenty years ago, before Howard wrote, before Sir George Paul began the carrying out of the reforms Howard suggested, before the reformatories of England had been established by Mr. Baker, Miss Carpenter, Mr. Turner, and hundreds of others, who have been benefactors to their country and their race. He writes apparently in entire ignorance that crime in England has, within forty years, diminished more than twenty-five per cent, not in proportion to the increased population, but actually, and he shows almost equal ignorance or carelessness in other directions. But despite this, which must create a doubt of the accuracy of all his figures, he does not exaggerate, nor can any one exaggerate the horrors, moral and physical, suffered by what he calls "the submerged tenth" of the population of England. He does not exaggerate, no one could exaggerate, the weight of responsibility resting upon the community amid which they exist, to do all that may be done to rescue them and their children, whether they are actually a tenth or only a hundredth of the people. General Booth is very wise in recognizing the fact that what is needed is to change the habits, often to change the very nature of these people, and to control and guide them every step of the way up the steep hill they must climb, out of the depths in which they are now perishing, to the level of decent self-support. General Booth sees so clearly many sides of the problem presented, that it is strange that he fails to see the dangers of the plan he proposes, if carried out by the method he proposes.

One longs to have the city shelters, the factories, the farm colonies, the over-sea colonies, each and all ready to rescue the unhappy beings whose stories are told in General Booth's book, but if every one of the 3,000,000 men, women, and children whom he enumerates as the denizens of Darkest England were safely housed in one or other of these havens by January 1st, 1892, would there be fewer men sleeping on the embankments, fewer prostitutes, fewer drunkards, fewer "out-of-works" in London and elsewhere? That is the question.

As has been said, the whole point of General Booth's "scheme," so far as it deals with the unemployed, is that the miserable, drunken, idle, homeless men and women, who starve in the great cities, shall be collected together, be fed and clothed and made to work, be carried out of the cities, and finally be reabsorbed into a natural country life. Certainly, nothing could be more to be desired. But who are these miserable, homeless men and women? Where do they come from? General Booth himself says:

"After careful examination and close cross-questioning of the out-of-works, whom we have already registered at our labor bureau, we find that at least sixty per cent are country folk, men, women, boys, and girls, who have left their homes in the counties to come up to town in the hope of bettering themselves. They are in no sense of the word cockneys, and they represent not the dregs of the country, but rather its brighter and more adventurous spirits, who have boldly tried to make their way in new and uncongenial spheres and have terribly come to grief."

This he says himself, but he fails to see what it means. If, under all the sad and terrible conditions described by him, the great city is still so attractive that it draws from the country, day after day, "the brightest and more adventurous spirits," if all the horrors that now await some of them do not suffice to keep back the inpouring stream, will not the lifting out of thousands, providing them with shelter and work, and finally removing them from London, only increase the influx of country people, and so continue and aggravate all the evils which now appall General Booth? He says that "the worst of all existing schemes for social betterment by organization of the skilled workers and the like is that they are founded not upon 'rock,' or even upon 'sand,' but upon the bottomless bog of the stratum of the workless." Can we drain a bottomless bog by drawing water *through* it?

This is what would be the practical result of the establishment of General Booth's scheme, and the end would be worse than the beginning. Even now, in London, it is the manifold refuges, the many chances for picking up a living which creates part of the evil. Miss Beatrice Potter, in one of her powerful articles in Mr. Charles Booth's book on "Life and Work in the East of London," speaks of the forces which "encourage and enable the worker to cast off wage-earning capacity and deteriorate into the industrial parasite," and she says, "the ease of living without regular wage is at once the result and the cause of irregular employment." General Booth would probably answer that it is not his intention to allow any one to live without work, but his factories would not supply "regular wage," and would only encourage the tendency to trust to luck, which is one cause of the misery of thousands who are not vicious, but only shiftless and weak. General Booth begs the question when he says he can "provide food, clothes, and shelter for all these out-of-works, without any loss of self respect, ... *providing only that they are willing to work*," and again, "so long as a man or woman *is willing to submit to the discipline* indispensable in every campaign against any formidable foe, there appears to me nothing impossible in this ideal." (The italics are not General Booth's.) In these sentences he has named the two conditions which are not fulfilled and cannot be fulfilled in the majority of the cases of those he seeks to help, unless other methods than those he suggests are adopted.

The horns of the dilemma are these: if artificial work under circumstances which do not repel is given, it will attract many who could, if driven by necessity, find it for themselves, and thus the whole enterprise will be rendered useless, not only because it does not reach the people for whom it is intended, but also because it will break down under the tremendous pressure of numbers. If, on the other hand, work is furnished under distasteful circumstances, even the direful "out-of-works" described by General Booth will not take it, and will often be justified by an ignorant public opinion in refusing it. General Booth himself apparently thinks that the man who prefers to beg and steal rather than take the work and help provided for him under the laws of England is to be sympathized with and almost commended. In his chapter on "The Homeless," he quotes the following incident from a Liverpool paper, saying, "It impressed me much":

"The speaker was haranguing a small knot of twenty or thirty men. 'My lads,' he commenced, with one hand in the breast of his ragged vest and the other, as usual, plucking nervously at his beard, 'this kind o' work can't last forever.' (Deep and earnest exclamations. 'It can't! It sha'n't!') 'Well, boys,' continued the speaker, 'somebody'll have to find a road out o' this. What we want is work, not work'us bounty, though the parish has been busy enough among us lately, God knows! What we want is honest work.' (Hear! hear!) 'Now, what I propose is that each of you gets fifty mates to join you; that'll make about 1200 starving chaps—' 'And then?' asked several very gaunt and hungry-looking men excitedly. 'Why, then,' continued their leader— 'Why, then,' interrupted a cadaverous-looking man from the farther and darkest end of the cellar, 'of course we'll make a—London job of it, eh?' 'No, no,' hastily interposed my friend, and holding up his hands deprecatingly, 'we'll go peaceably about it, chaps; we'll go in a body to the Town Hall, and show our poverty, and ask for work. We'll take the women and children with us, too.' ('Too ragged! Too starved! They can't walk it!') 'The women's rags is no disgrace, the staggerin' children'll show what we come to. Let's go a thousand strong, and ask for work and bread!'"

It is strange that General Booth fails to see what it was natural, perhaps, that the poor men in question could not themselves see, that the speaker, in the same breath, repudiated "work'us bounty," and demanded of the public "work and bread," which is what the workhouse is designed to supply, on such terms, however, as will not plunge the whole nation into want. Once, during about forty years, England sought to give bread and work, *on their own terms*, to all who asked for it. Harriet Martineau described the result, which was due, without doubt, to the carrying out of the theory that every man who could not earn his bread had the right to get bread from the public, and to get it under conditions as little disagreeable as possible to himself. When, in 1834, the theory was repudiated by the adoption of the new Poor Law, the situation was at once improved. But this is what it was in 1832, as described by Harriet Martineau:

"They bestowed on unproductive consumers the bread which they took out of the mouths of the profitable laborers; and they, one by one, ground down the profitable laborers to the grade of unproductive consumers. The dream of Pharaoh, that 'seven lean and ill-favored kine did eat up seven fat kine, and when they had eaten them up it could not be known they had eaten them, but they were still ill-favored as at the beginning,' was realized to the laborers of England under the old Poor Laws. The poor rate had become public spoil. The ignorant believed it an inexhaustible fund which belonged to them. To obtain their share, the brutal bullied the administrators; the profligate exhibited their bastards, which must be fed; the idle folded their arms and waited until they got it; ignorant girls and boys married upon it; poachers, thieves, and prostitutes extorted it by intimidation; county justices lavished it for popularity, and guardians for convenience. . . . The rate-paying cottager, after a vain struggle, went to the pay-table to seek relief; the modest girl might starve, while her bolder neighbor received one shilling and sixpence a week for every illegitimate child. Industry, probity, purity, prudence—all heart and spirit—the whole of goodness—were melting down into depravity and social ruin, like snow under the foul internal fires which precede the earthquakes" (*History of the Peace*, vol. iii., pp. 323 sqq.).

It is impossible that any private relief should cause such widespread demoralization, for the means cannot be obtained to carry out such a wholesale scheme; but this is the result that is to be feared in proportion as the scheme grows in dimensions, and General Booth's declared purpose is to obtain the means to put a wholesale scheme into operation.

But it is an ungrateful task to criticise what one in fact heartily commends.

There can be no doubt that the things General Booth proposes to do should be done. There is no doubt that these men and women wandering in the great cities, sunk in misery and sin, should be rescued, whether they be 3,000,000, or 300,000, or 3000. There is no doubt that General Booth is right in saying that these people must be lifted out of their present circumstances, but he is still more right in saying:

"The supreme test of any scheme for benefiting humanity lies in the answer to the question, What does it make of the individual? Does it quicken his conscience, does it soften his heart, does it enlighten his mind, does it, in short, make more of a true man of him, because only by such influences can he be enabled to lead a human life? Among the denizens of Darkest England there are many who have found their way thither by defects of character which would under the most favorable circumstances relegate them to the same position. Hence, unless you can change their character your labor will be lost. You may clothe the drunkard, fill his purse with gold, establish him in a well-furnished home, and in three, or six, or twelve months he will once more be on the embankment, haunted by *delirium tremens*, dirty, squalid, and ragged. Hence, in all cases where a man's own character and defects constitute the reasons for his fall, that character must be changed and that conduct altered if any permanent beneficial results are to be attained. If he is a drunkard, he must be made sober; if idle, he must be made industrious; if criminal, he must be made honest; if impure, he must be made clean; and if he be so deep down in vice, and has been there so long that he has lost all heart, and hope, and power to help himself, and absolutely refuses to move, he must be inspired with hope, and have created within him the ambition to rise; otherwise he will never get out of the horrible pit."

General Booth's plans are wise; it is through such plans as these that the people he describes are to be helped; but in order to do it, the plans must be carried out by law, must be put into operation by the power which alone can force the people to work, and which alone can secure the discipline necessary for regeneration, and which alone can make the conditions so salutary and so unpleasant that, while offering education, help, and rescue to all who really need it, it will also repel all who do not need it.

The only ground upon which his scheme is to be criticised is that what he proposes to do must be done not by private enterprise alone, but by public agencies *aided* by private charity, which could supply the moral and religious influences and the personal interest in individuals which are the vital points in General Booth's scheme, and the foundation of its strength.

Such great agencies as he proposes for supplying the temporal needs of those in want could not safely be left to the charge of private persons, but were they inaugurated and governed by law, and in the hands of public officials, the stigma which accompanies the receipt of "public relief" would to a degree mitigate the dangers of tempting those for whom such aid was not necessary to apply for it, and with the help of private beneficence they would do the least harm and the greatest amount of good possible to any such undertaking. The great point made by General Booth is his demand for adequate and permanent help for those needing it, as against the often lamentably insufficient temporary help offered to them by existing societies and associations, and General Booth would doubtless be surprised to learn that in making this demand the London Charity Organization Society, which he mentions only once in his book, was twenty-two years before him, the difference being that the Charity Organization Society desires to inspire the already existing charitable societies, and the people already working inefficiently, to improve their methods and do their work better, while General Booth almost ignores those already at work on the problems he presents, and proposes to do everything by his own power and that of his Salvation Army.

But there is one of General Booth's suggestions, included in the second part of his plan, which is original and is eminently worthy of adoption, and that is the establishment of "Asylums for Moral Lunatics," where the men and women who have proved themselves to be incorrigible should be shut away from harming themselves and others. General Booth forcibly argues:

"It is a crime against the race to allow those who are so inveterately depraved the freedom to wander abroad, infect their fellows, prey upon society, and to multiply their kind. Whatever else society may do and suffer to be done, this thing it ought not to allow, any more than it should allow the free perambulation of a mad dog. But before we come to this I would have every possible means tried to effect their reclamation. Let Justice punish them, and Mercy put her arms around them; let them be appealed to by penalty and by reason, and by every influence, human and Divine, that can possibly be brought to bear upon them. Then, if all alike failed, their ability to further curse their fellows and themselves should be stayed.

"They will still remain objects worthy of infinite compassion. They should lead as human a life as it is possible to those who have fallen under so terrible a judgment. They should have their own little cottages in their own little gardens, under the blue sky, and, if possible, amid the green fields. I would deny them none of the advantages, moral, mental, and religious which might minister to their diseased minds, and tend to restore them to a better state. Not until the breath leaves their bodies should we cease to labor and wrestle for their salvation; but when they have reached a certain point access to their fellow-men should be forbidden. Between them and the wide world there should be reared an impassable barrier, which once passed should be recrossed no more forever. Such a course must be wiser than allowing them to go in and out among their fellows, carrying with them the contagion of moral leprosy, and multiplying a progeny doomed before its birth to inherit the vices and diseased cravings of their unhappy parents."

JOSEPHINE SHAW LOWELL.

NEW YORK.

THE EVIDENCE OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. Being the Ely Lectures for 1890. By LEWIS FRENCH STEARNS, Professor of Christian Theology in Bangor Theological Seminary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1890. 8vo, pp. viii., 473, $2.00.

This work is a valuable contribution to Christian apologetics. It reconstructs the argument for Christianity in accordance with similar discussions of Frank, Dorner, and other German theologians, but in a form less abstruse, in better proportion, and more strongly guarded against objections. The book takes rank in the very first class of modern defences of the Christian faith, and should be read by all students of theology whether they are young or old.

The author has a twofold object: To develop the full force of the argument from Christian experience in its own direct certainty and in its dependence on the objective revelation recorded in the Bible, and also to show that it is the ultimate ground of conviction, the central proof of the truth and divineness of the Gospel, about which all other proofs cluster in a relation of dependence. The object is to recover an argument which has been considered secondary to a place of central and commanding importance.

The first chapter shows the inadequacy of the arguments employed in the last century, when miracles and the fulfilment of prophecy were considered the principal evidences of a revelation which was then to be accepted with its entire contents as recorded in the Bible. When this was followed by various attempts to explain away miracles through natural causes, and to question the fidelity of the narratives, and by the tendency of the doctrine of evolution to undermine faith in the supernatural, the defence of Christianity was obliged to develop the character of the truth of the Gospel, the significance and uniqueness of the person of Christ, and the redemptive power of the Gospel in every age, including the present. From historical evidence of the facts of Christianity, which includes the genuineness and trustworthiness of the biblical record and therefore all questions of biblical criticism, as well as the evidence from prophecy and miracles, the argument now passes over into the rational, which has to do with Christianity as a system of truth, and includes the person of Christ in his life and redemptive work, the intrinsic excellence of the Christian system, and kindred considerations, and finally modern discussion proceeds to the working power of Christianity in society and its transforming power in the life. This brings us to the evidence of Christian experience with which the book before us is occupied. It is "derived from the manifestation to the believer himself in his own spiritual life of the presence and power of God and the Christian realities. It is the evidence that is based upon the Christian's regeneration and sanctification." After showing in two chapters entitled "Theological Pre-suppositions" and "Anthropological Pre-suppositions" that God is the life of man, the nature of Christian experience in its genesis and development is brought into correspondence with the truths of the Gospel to show that the reality of the Father's love, the Saviour's grace, and the spirit's communion are recognized and certified. Then it is argued that this is the true ground of certainty. Since the purpose of Christianity is to produce a certain kind of life, a renewal of man from sin to holiness, a reconciliation and union with God, the test of the reality and power of God's revelation in Christ must, in the last analysis, be that very life which it is given to produce.

The historical proof that Jesus Christ lived, taught, died, and rose again, that the Bible contains an authentic account of him, and that the Christian Church sprung up in the world, make it probable that God seeks and saves men through Christ. The results of Christianity in society and civilization strengthens the probability that Christ was sent from God to establish his kingdom. But the certainty that God finds men in their sins and saves them, and knowledge of the nature of his power as it thus works, can be gained only by experience. Moreover, the Christian Church and Christian civilization are only the results of that first and great result, the new life in Jesus Christ. It is true that this experience is peculiar. It corresponds to the realities which stand before faith. It is moral, spiritual, religious in distinctive ways. But this should be expected. All knowledge of conviction and experience is determined by the characteristics of the truth which is known. It would, indeed, be strange if such a revelation did not produce an experience or a life above the ordinary level. The absence of it would be conclusive proof that the revelation, whatever truth it might contain, is not a gospel of redemption for sinful man.

Although the evidence of experience is ultimate, it is not independent of objective truth nor of the Bible which records the truth. Were there no body of facts and no knowledge of those facts there would be no corresponding experience. But the complete authority of the Scriptures and of the truth they contain cannot be realized until the truth has produced its effect in the life. The objective truth is not known by outward evidences as the power of God unto salvation. One does not know until he can say "I know whom I have believed." The truth and the life are thus inseparable, but conviction of the authority of the truth is gained only when it produces fruit in the life.

Various objections to the position taken are successfully removed, and after the lectures are notes of reference and a full index. The author has put his best thought into the work, so that it is original and characteristic throughout while the touch of reality and feeling at every point shows that he has dealt, not with a theory of experience, but with the experience itself. GEORGE HARRIS.

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

BELIEF IN GOD: ITS ORIGIN, NATURE, AND BASIS. (Winkley Lectures, Andover Theological Seminary, 1890). By JACOB GOULD SCHURMAN. New York: Scribners, 1890. Cloth, $1.25.

Professor Schurman's work consists of six lectures delivered before the Andover Theological Seminary. In the first lecture, agnosticism is discussed and shown to be a special form of dogmatism. Instead of being pre-suppositionless, agnosticism rests on the assumed truth, either of the Humian sensationalism, or of the Kantian phenomenalism. In the second lecture, under the title of the Logical Character of the Belief in God, theism is shown to be a legitimate scientific hypothesis. To the unpracticed reader this will seem to be a very small net result, but one acquainted with the course of thought in this field will not fail to appreciate its value. For (a) theism is a *legitimate* hypothesis. Hence agnosticism, positivism, phenomenalism are set aside. Again (b)theism is a *scientific* hypothesis. Hence as theists we are not appealing to some strange method, or taking our stand outside of the limits of recognized logical reasoning.

The third lecture is on the Origin and Development of the Belief in God. This is chiefly historical. Its place in the argument is to show that theism is the goal toward which man's growing consciousness of God has always tended. At times, human thought has fallen short of theism, and stopped in atheism; at other times, it has transcended theism and fallen into pantheism. But history plainly shows that the centre of equilibrium of human thought lies in theism.

The fourth lecture treats of God as Cause or Ground of the World. Here the causal argument is dealt with. In its familiar form, the author finds it unsatisfactory, and substitutes for it the conception of immanent causation, which, however, he carefully distinguishes from pantheism. The fifth lecture treats of the Belief in God as realizing Purpose in the World. Here the doctrine of the divine immanence is once more emphasized, and the theological aspects of the world are discussed. The author shows how groundless were the fears of a few years ago which saw in Darwinism or Evolution any answer to theological questions. These find no answer except in intelligence. In the sixth lecture on Belief in God as Father of Spirits, the moral argument is discussed and set aside as inconclusive, logically considered. At the same time, it is shown that the moral nature of God is needed for the interpretation of the moral life of man. A being simply intelligent and volitional would account for the phenomena of the material world, but would give no account of our moral nature, which is as real as any other fact of the universe. Taking all these considerations into account, the conclusion is drawn that the belief in a God of love and wisdom as the cause and ground of the world is the only one in which the human mind can rest.

Professor Schurman's work is much larger than it seems. It is excellent in tone and temper, and fresh and interesting in exposition. Occasional positions and statements raise queries, of course. A single one may be mentioned: The dogma of creation is set aside in favor of immanent causality. But unless we are to take the "dogma of creation" in so coarse a sense that it needs no setting aside, it is not easy to see how we escape it by the doctrine of immanence. Creation may be sufficiently defined as the dependence of things on the divine will in such a way that without that will they would not be, and in such a way that they are not to be viewed as made out of the divine substance. All that is said about the inconceivability of creation applies equally to this relation. We certainly have no means of picturing such relation to ourselves. Nor are we helped by the frequent assurance that nature is the eternal manifestation of God, and that creation never took place in time. This seems to confound creating with the products of creating. We may say that there never was a time when there was no cosmic outgo of the divine activity. In this sense, creating would be unbegun. But the cosmos as a whole could not be unbegun unless all its components are unbegun. But these components, say human souls, begin. How, then, can we escape affirming a perpetual beginning of creative activity; that is, an activity which causes that to be which before was not? It is to be suspected that the author has here fallen into the fallacy of the universal and overlooked the fact that however unbegun or eternal "Nature" may be, the concrete realities, notably our own souls, do not seem unbegun. Undoubtedly an immanent causation is to be maintained as against a single act remote in time; but such immanent causation does not dispense with the necessity of affirming distinct creative acts throughout the course of events, nor remove the puzzles which lie in the notion of an eternal creation of a series every member of which begins.

Immanent theism has much more success in dealing with the relation of God and nature than in dealing with the relation of God and the finite spirit. There is little trouble in resolving nature into a function of the divine activity; but it is extremely difficult to do this with the human soul while affirming for it any measure of selfhood and responsibility. The author clearly sees the necessity of affirming both the selfhood and responsibility of the finite person, and also the dependence of all finite existence upon the divine. How these two facts co-exist is one of the deep mysteries of existence. The author certainly casts a very dim light upon the matter by the following words: "And for my own part, I am unable to see how we can believe in God without at the same time regarding the finite spirit, so far as its essential ground is concerned, as identical, within the limits of its range, with the infinite Spirit" (p. 227). Nor are we helped to the meaning of "identical" in this passage by being told on the next page that the ego is, "as it were, a part of the divine essence."

BORDEN P. BOWNE.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY.

THE MIRACLES OF OUR SAVIOUR. Expounded and Illustrated by WILLIAM M. TAYLOR, D.D., LL.D., Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1890. Royal 12mo, pp. vi., 449, $1.75.

This new work on the miracles of our Lord consists of Sabbath evening discourses preached at the Broadway Tabernacle, in the ordinary course of the author's ministry. Dr. Taylor evidently has no sympathy with a certain class of writers in our day who disparage the apologetic value of our Lord's miracles, and feel the supernatural element in them "a heavy burden, grievous to be borne."

In his definition of a miracle—"A work out of the usual sequence of secondary causes and effects, which cannot be accounted for by the ordinary operation of these causes, and which is produced by the agency of God, through the instrumentality of one who claims to be his representative, and in attestation of a message which as such he brings" —p. 4, he fully recognizes the supernatural character of the miracle, and its apologetic worth.

These discourses, as was altogether proper in the circumstances in which they were delivered, are "expository and practical rather than apologetic;" and the informing idea which determines their character is expressed in the words, "While at the first the miracles were wrought mainly as authentications and confirmations of the commission and teaching of Christ and his apostles, they had another and quite different value, as being themselves parts of the revelation which our Lord made, and parabolical illustrations of the great salvation which he preached. Their evidential function was mainly for the conviction of those who witnessed them at the time when they were wrought; but their spiritual teaching is for all time. . . . As types in the department of nature, of the Lord's working in that of grace, we shall find them exceedingly suggestive and intensely practical" (pp. 26, 27).

An instance of the author's thorough recognition of the "supernatural" element in our Lord's miracles, we have in his treatment of the account of the demons when cast out of the demoniac at Gadara entering into a herd of swine. "Few incidents," writes he, "in the Gospel history have been assailed with so much ridicule as this. It has been alleged that the very idea of demons entering into swine is in itself absurd; but to me there is nothing more mysterious in that than there is in their entering into a human being. In the lower animals there are certain principles or propensities which are closely allied to some which we find in ourselves. Now, for aught we know, it may have been in connection with these that the demons took possession of men, and if that were so, they might enter through the same principles and propensities into animals. So, if we accept the reality of human possession by evil spirits, we need not make a difficulty of their entering into the lower animals" (p. 221). In his controversy with Dr. Wace, published in the *Nineteenth Century* for March, 1889, Professor Huxley writes, "I venture to doubt whether, at this present moment, any Protestant theologian, who has a reputation to lose, will say that he believes in the Gadarine story." In view of the above quotation, I would ask Professor Huxley's attention to the fact that at the very time he was giving expression to his doubt, Dr. Taylor, a theologian in the best sense of that term—one whose chosen life-work it is to preach God's truth to the people—and one whose reputation for scholarly preaching is second to that of no one in Great Britain or America, in a discourse addressed to an exceptionally large and intelligent congregation, and subsequently published in the volume before us, gives expression to his thorough belief in "the Gadarine story" in all its particulars.

An illustration of Dr. Taylor's happy application of the practical lessons of the miracles to the Christian's need in our day, we have in his exposition of the "healing of Peter's wife's mother." "Just as although the husbandman prays, 'Give us this day our daily bread,' he takes good care to plough his fields and sow his seed, the sick man who prays that Christ may make him whole will send for the physician and faithfully apply the remedies which he prescribes, and will look for an answer to his prayer through the Lord's blessing on these remedies, or through the providential suggestion to the mind of the medical man of other remedies which may be efficacious. To take another course, and trust in prayer alone, is to follow a course which in its own way is as dishonoring to God as is the blackest unbelief. Effort without prayer is an ignoring of God; but prayer without effort is a mockery of God. The true believer is he who combines both prayer and effort" (p. 94).

In concluding this brief notice of Dr. Taylor's book, and after carefully reading it through from beginning to end—a thing not always done by reviewers—I wish especially to commend it to the attention (1) of intelligent Christian men and women throughout our churches as one which they will find pleasant and profitable reading; and (2) to ministers who have learned how to use profitably the sermons of others, as an exceedingly suggestive book, one which they will find a real help in preparing to preach God's truth as set forth in our Lord's miracles. GEORGE D. ARMSTRONG.

NORFOLK, VA.

AIDS TO SCRIPTURE STUDY. By FREDERIC GARDINER, late Professor in the Berkeley Divinity School. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1890. 12mo, pp. ix., 284, $1.25.

This volume consists of two main parts, preceded by an introduction in which the position of the writer is set forth in connection with some of the questions of biblical criticism. These two parts are entitled, "The Preparation for Interpreting" and "The Art of Interpreting." A few quotations will show the author's position and give the means of forming a fair judgment. In regard to alleged errors in matters of natural science he says:

"They are due not to the human imperfection of the writers, but to that of the readers; they are simply the necessary limitation of revelation in making itself intelligible to those to whom it was given. They are consistent, therefore, with the view that all the teaching of the Scriptures is controlled by infinite knowledge, and that the human writers have been so limited as to prevent their introducing into them the errors of their own private notions" (p. 21).

In regard to the question of inspiration, he says: "Is there any other logical conclusion from this than that, whatever else be or be not the function of inspiration, its scope included the preservation of the Bible from error, and the giving to man of a book on which he may rely absolutely as the Word of God" (p. 62).

In regard to the duty of the exegete, he says: "He must interpret not only in view of the opinions of the individual writers, but also according to the infinite knowledge and truth which lay behind them, and which exercised over them an indescribable but potent influence. And he must do this not by subtleties and technicalities, but by open and manly treatment of the text before him" (p. 63).

Revelation is represented as a growing body of truth adapted to men:

"Again, it is plain . . . that the Bible is the record of a progressive revelation given to mankind from age to age with more and more distinctness according to man's capacity to receive it. To estimate fairly the degree of truth at any time conveyed, and to guard against the very common but unscholarly objection, that it was not given with greater fulness, it is necessary to understand, not only the extent of previous revelations, but also the actual moral condition of the people to whom it was given . . ." (p. 92).

Fantastic notions and strained interpretations after which some seem to strive, and which are dubbed original by many, are discredited, and the true path pointed out in such words as these:

"True originality here, as in natural science, consists not in the finding of something absolutely new, but in drawing attention to facts not heretofore observed or not sufficiently regarded, and combining those facts naturally and truly, but in combinations heretofore overlooked. For such originality there is ample room in the constant advance of knowledge in every department" (p. 158).

The indirect and also the direct advantage of extensive knowledge, and the fact that one would not be conscious of his loss in a given case, but for the possession of a given piece of information, are well brought out in these words:

"Indeed, it often happens that he can bring a previously acquired geographical knowledge to bear most effectively, when, but for the knowledge possessed, he might not have known that it would be of use" (p. 189).

In the department of hermeneutics there are few books in English, and this new one does not encroach upon the special field of any. It is short, simple, and suggestive rather than exhaustive. It bears somewhat the same relation to Terry's Hermeneutics, for instance, that the so-called Formal Encyclopædia does to Material Encyclopædia. It is indicative of the importance of the subject, and may be regarded as an introduction rather than a full treatment of the matters in question. But in saying this there is no desire to detract from the credit due the work of a master hand. When one takes up the volume of Ernesti, translated by Stuart, it is like taking up a grammar or a book of rules. Fairbairn and Immer are circumscribed in their scope. Davidson presents a vast amount of material which rather intimidates by its extent, while one feels that Terry has taken enough space to have exhausted the subject. In contrast to all these is the present volume. It is written in such a flowing and easy style that one is impelled to read on till one has finished the last chapter. Great credit is due to the editor in that the reader is at a loss to know where his hand has been exercised, for he has withdrawn himself so far into the background that he is not visible. It would have added to the value of the work, undoubtedly, if the writer had lived to put it to press, but in Professor Ferguson he has had a worthy literary executor.

There is no question that a perusal of Professor Gardiner's words will serve to impress upon his readers that the work of interpretation is not a matter to be taken up without preparation or to be done in a slovenly way. His appeal is for honest work and for a proper preparation. He does not slur over the qualifications of the exegete and he does not minimize the toil of the undertaking. In every way he stands as the exponent of an upright and straightforward exegetical process. Whether one agrees with the author in all details is a matter of comparatively little moment in view of the fact that the whole spirit and tenor of the volume are so excellent and elevating. Its perusal cannot but exalt the process of interpretation and add dignity to the conscientious efforts of the careful student. It is to the whole field what a map is to a country, and it may be recommended for use side by side with the more exhaustive and detailed guide-book.

CHARLES R. GILLETT.

NEW YORK.

THE STORY OF THE TUNES. For Home Reading, Praise Meetings, and Lectures on Sacred Music.

Illustrated with Anecdotes. By Hezekiah Butterworth, A.M., Author of "The Story of the Hymns." New York: American Tract Society, 1890. 12mo, cloth, pp. 257, $1.75.

This volume has entered upon a new and a difficult field, not by any means so prolific as that which the author surveyed in "The Story of the Hymns." There is less known about the tunes than about the hymns. The repertoire of the church is very broad, and we find here the classic names of Haydn, Handel, Mozart and Bach in an association which those masters could hardly have anticipated or approved. Yet these illustrious names could not be omitted in such a volume. The ephemeral music which has caught the popular ear is mingled with that which has been borrowed from the classics. The "refrain music" which has achieved popularity cannot be ignored. The people will have it, and they will be eager to know its history. Mr. Butterworth has sought to meet such demands, and he is right in this aim. But the list of authors makes a curious combination, and one that provokes criticism. Why do the old, solid, and substantial tunes have so little room in Mr. Butterworth's book? The tunes which are our dependence—why are they without adequate illustration? The English school is recognized with considerate judgment. But our standard tunes have but meagre notice. Revival tunes are exceptional tunes. They are short-lived. They are concessions to temporary taste and feeling. But the tunes which have passed through the long quarantine of actual trial, these are of superlative interest. And these have not such place and prominence in Mr. Butterworth's book as we could desire. Nevertheless, we welcome this volume as helpful to those who are aiming to increase the interest of Christian people in the Service of Song in the Sanctuary. The pastor who is seeking to make the "Praise Services" interesting and profitable to his people will find in this volume valuable help. It is a beginning in a new field, but it is only a beginning. Much more can be said than we find in this volume concerning the tunes which to-day constitute the true repertoire of the church. It is well that Mr. Butterworth has made this beginning. But there is a great deal more to which his work may direct attention. Thomas S. Hastings.

Union Theological Seminary.

Prayer as a Theory and a Fact. By the Rev. D. W. Faunce, D.D. New York: American Tract Society, 1890. 12mo, pp. 250, $1.

This is the Fletcher Prize Essay for 1889. There are some excellent things about it. It is scholarly, and has a logical sequence of thought proceeding from the outskirts to the interior of the subject. It is modern in tone, and there are places where it is truly eloquent.

But it must be said regretfully that it is not likely to mark an era in the literature of prayer. No doubt the topic has been so long and so thoroughly discussed, that it is not easy to say anything about it which is at once new and true. Besides, there has been no recent novel assault on prayer—like that of the "Prayer-gauge" proposed by Professor Tyndall a few years ago—to suggest new lines of defence. But, making allowance for all that, we think that most of those who take up this essay will lay it down with a vague sense of disappointment. There is a certain strain in the style, which not only makes it somewhat difficult for him who runs to read, but, when the sense is mastered, it will often be found that the idea conveyed is more familiar and commonplace than the vehicle of its conveyance. As a naval architect would phrase it, the wave-line is not good, there is too much "wake" for the real rate of sailing. It is not a book to hold attention; it rather requires attention to hold it. But it is thoroughly orthodox, often felicitous, and many will find it rewarding. Perhaps if it had compressed its matter into half the space it had been more effective. There is certainly good stuff in it. Mancius H. Hutton.

New Brunswick, N. J.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Allier, Raoul. Les Défaillances de la Volonté au temps présent. Trois conférences prononcées à Paris et à Genève. Paris: Fischbacker, 1890. 12mo, 1.50 fr.

Armour, J. M. Mercy and the Law: Its Place in the Divine Government. Boston: Bradley, 1891. Pp. 280, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Avenarius, R., Prof., Dr. Kritik der reinen Erfahrung. 2. Band. Leipzig: Reisland, 1890. Pp. vi., 528, 8vo, 14 mk.

Bachmann, J. Präparation und Kommentar zu den Psalmen mit genauen Analysen und getreuer Uebersetzung für Gymnasiasten, Studirende, etc., herausgegeben. 2. Heft. Berlin: Schneider, 1891. Pp. 65–149, 8vo, 1 mk.

Bärthold, A. Die Frömmigkeit in den Geschichten des Alten Testaments. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1890. Pp. iii., 112, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Bautz, J. Grundzüge der katholischen Dogmatik. 3. Theil. Die Lehre von der Gnade. Die Lehre von den Sacramenten im Allgemeinen. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1890. Pp. vii., 166, 8vo, 2.70 mk.

Bellesheim, A. History of the Catholic Church of Scotland, from the Introduction of Christianity to the Present Day. 4 vols. Vol. 4. London: Blackwoods, 1890. Pp. 470, 8vo, 12s. 6d.

Bernays, J. Petrus Martyr Anglerius und sein opus epistolarum. Strassburg i. E.: Trübner, 1891. Pp. xvii., 247, 8vo, 6 mk.

Biedermann, Gust. Philosophie als Begriffswissenschaft. Moral-, Rechts-, und Religions-philosophie. Prag: Tempsky, 1890. Pp. v., xix., 45, ix., 69, xiii., 110, 8vo, 4.20 mk.

Bierbower, Austin. Socialism of Christ; or, Attitude of Early Christians toward Modern Problems. Chicago: Sergee. 1891. Pp. 202, 12mo, $1.00.

Binger, Capitaine. Esclavage, Islamisme et Christianisme. Paris, 1890, 8vo, 2.50 fr.

Bolliger, A. Beiträge zur Dogmatik und Ethik. Acht Vorträge. Aarau: Sauerländer, 1890. Pp. xii., 186, 8vo, 2 mk.

Bonsmann, Th. Gregor I. der Grosse. Ein Lebensbild. Paderborn: Junfermann, 1890. Pp. 104, 8vo, 1 mk.

Bruston, C. La Vie future d'après l'enseignement de Jésus-Christ. Paris, 1891.

Buchwald, Rud. De liturgia Gallicana. Dissertatio. Wratislaviæ: Wilpert, 1890. Pp. 42, 8vo, 1 mk.

Chamard, Père. La Revolution, le concordat, et la liberté religieuse. Paris: Letouzey, 1890, 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Cheever, George B., D.D., Late Pastor of the Church of the Puritans, Memorabilia of —, and of his Wife, Elizabeth Watmore Cheever. In prose and verse. New York: Wiley, 1891. Pp. xxxiii., 361, 12mo, $2.00.

Church, A. J. Stories from the Bible. With illustrations after Julius Schnorr. New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. x., 283, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Corblet, Jules Abbé. Histoire dogmatique, liturgique et archéologique du sacrement de l'Eucharistie. 2 vols. Le Mans: Monnoyer, 1891. Pp. iv., 643, 657, 8vo.

Cox, Samuel, D.D. The Book of Ecclesiastes. With a new translation. (Expositor's Bible.) New York: Armstrong, 1891. Pp. xvi., 335, 12mo, $1.50.

Cramer, J. Exegetica et critica. I. (Nieuwe bijdragen op het gebied van godgeleerdheid en wijsbegeerte. VIII. 1.) Utrecht: Breijer, 1890. Pp. iv., 72, 8vo, 0.85 fl.

Cross, Joseph, D.D., LL.D. Days of my Years. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. viii., 319, 12mo, $1.50.

Dixon, R. W. History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction. Vol. 4. London: Routledge, 1891. Pp. 774, 8vo, 16s.

Dodge, Mary Abigail ("Gail Hamilton," pseud). A Washington Bible Class. New York: Appleton, 1891. Pp. iii., 303, 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Eibenschitz, Jonathan, Rabbi. Schem Olam. Philosophisch-Kabbalist. Abhandlungen und Briefe. Nach einer einzigen Handschrift nebst einer Einleitung von Dr. S. Rubin. Als Beitrag zur Geschichte der Eibenschitz'schen Kabbala, mit erklärenden Anmerkungen herausgegeben von Arth. S. Weissmann. (Hebräisch.) 2. Theil. Wien: Lippe, 1891. Pp. 113-324, 8vo, 1 50 mk.

Fabius, D. P. D. Mozaisch en Romeinsch recht. Eene vergelijkende rechtsstudie. Rede. Amsterdam: Wormser, 1890. Pp. iv., 78, 8vo, 1.10 fl.

Foster, Randolph S., Rev., D.D., LL.D. Studies in Theology. Evidences of Christianity. The Supernatural Book. New York: Hunt, 1891. Pp. xiv., 430, 8vo, $3.00.

Frackers, V. C. L. M. E. Godsdienst en natuurwetenschap. Voordracht. Zwolle: Tijl, 1890. Pp. 55, 8vo, 0.50 fl.

Frohschammer, J. Ueber das Mysterium magnum des Daseins. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1891. Pp. xiii., 183, 8vo, 4 mk.

Garland, G. V. The Practical Teaching of the Apocalypse. New York: Longmans, 1890. Pp. x., 498, 8vo, cloth, $5.00.

Gautier, L. La Mission du prophète Ezéchiel. Lausanne: Bridel, 1890. Pp. 376, 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Gilmartin, T. Manual of Church History. Vol. 1. Dublin: Gill, 1891. Pp. 538, 8vo, 8s. 6d.

Great Discourse of Jesus the Christ, the Son of God. A topical arrangement and analysis of all his words recorded in the New Testament, separated from the context. New York: Randolph, 1891. Pp. xxxi., 361, 8vo, $1.50.

Grotz, A. Avec Dieu et le Christ. Sermons. Paris: Fischbacker, 1891. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Gutschmid, A. v. Kleine Schriften. Herausgegeben von F. Rühl. 2 Band. Schriften zur Geschichte und Literatur der semitischen Völker und zur älteren Kirchengeschichte. Leipzig: Teubner, 1890. Pp. viii., 794, 8vo, 24 mk.

Hall, N. Gethsemane; or, Leaves of Healing from the Garden of Grief. New York: Scribners, 1891. Pp. viii., 326, 8vo, $2.00.

Harris, Maurice H., A.M., Ph.D. The People of the Book. A Bible history for religious schools, with a useful appendix. From creation to the death of Moses. New York: Cowen, 1891. Pp. xi., 184, 12mo.

Herzog, H. Bilder aus der Kirchengeschichte. Aarau: Sauerländer, 1890. Pp. viii., 488, 8vo, 4 mk.

Hess. Ein Ausschnitt aus der Wellhausen'schen Hypothese. Vortrag. Kaiserslautern: Tascher, 1890. Pp. 38, 8vo, 40 pf.

Hoare, J. G. Christ Revealed in Title, Type, and Prophecy. With side-lights on the lessons by Rev. Robert R. Resker. London: S. S. Inst., 1890. Pp. 133, 8vo, 2s.

Holland, C. Gleanings from a Ministry of 50 Years. London: Stock, 1891. 8vo, 5s.

Hollard, Roger. Méditations évangéliques. Tome II. Paris: Fischbacker, 1891. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Hurlbut, Jesse L., Rev., D.D. Scripture Selections for Daily Reading. A portion of the Bible for every day in the year. New York: Hunt & E., 1891. Pp. xiii., 433, 8vo, $1.50.

Hurlbut, Jesse L., Rev., D.D. Studies in the Old Testament History. New York: Hunt & E., 1891. Pp. iii., 98, 8vo, pap., 25 cts., cloth, 40 cts.

Jacolliot. Le Spiritisme dans le monde. Initiation et les sciences occultes dans l'Inde et chez tous les peuples de l'antiquité. Paris: Flammarion, 1891. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Jeaffreson, H. H. Magnificat: A Course of Sermons. London: Paul, 1891. Pp. 130, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Kennedy, J. H. Natural Theology and Modern Thought: The Donellan Lectures delivered before the University of Dublin, 1888-89. London: Hodder, 1891. Pp. 276, 8vo, 5s.

Kingsley, C. Westminster Sermons. With a preface. New York: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. xxx., 312, 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

Latham, H. Pastor Pastorum; or, The Schooling of the Apostles by our Lord. London: Bell & S., 1890. Pp. 482, 8vo, 6s. 6d.

Leckie, Joseph. Life and Religion. With biographical sketches by his son. Glasgow: Maclehose, 1890. Pp. 366, 8vo, 6s.

Leeuwen, E. H. van. Prolegomena van bijbelsche godgeleerdheid. Utrecht: Breijer, 1890. Pp. viii., 150, 8vo, 1.50 fl.

Leibnitz, The Philosophical Works of. Comprising the monadology, new system of nature, principles of nature and of grace, letters to Clarke, refutation of Spinoza, and his other important philosophical opuscules, together with the abridgment of the Theodicy and extracts from the new essays on human understanding. Translated from the original Latin and French. With notes by George Martin Duncan. New Haven, Conn.: Tuttle, M. & T., 1891. Pp. 392, 8vo.

Lillie, A. Buddha and his Parables. London: Simpkin, 1890. Pp. 100, 16mo, 1s. 6d.

Lightfoot, Jos. B., Bp., D.D. Cambridge Sermons. New York: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. xii., 334, 12mo, cloth, $1.75.

Loewenthal, A., Dr. Pseudo-Aristoteles über die Seele. Eine psychologische Schrift des 11. Jahrhunderts und ihre Beziehungen zu Salomo ibn Gabirol (Avicebron). Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Zunz-Stiftung. Berlin: Mayer & M., 1891. Pp. viii., 131, 12, 8vo, 3 mk.

Maronier, J. H. Het inwendig woord. Enige bladzijden uit de geschiedenis der Hervorming. Amsterdam: Holkema, 1890. Pp. viii., 332, 8vo.

Martha, E. Le Surnaturel: la Bonté; le Christianisme dans le monde. Lyon: Pitrat. 1890. Pp. 177, 16mo.

Martineau, Jas. Essays, Reviews and Addresses. Selected and revised by the author. Vol. I. Personal; political. New York: Longmans, 1891. Pp. iv., 527, 12mo, $2.50.

Meyer, F. B. Joseph: — Beloved, Hated, Exalted. New York & Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 192, cloth, $1.00.

Moore, A. C. Lectures and Papers on the History of the Reformation in England and on the Continent. London: 1890. Pp. 536, 8vo.

Mozley, T. Letters from Rome on the Occasion of the Œcumenical Council, 1869-70. 2 vols. New York: Longmans, 1891. Pp. vi., 440; vi., 452, 8vo, $6.00.

Müller, E. Die Wunder um den Heiland der Welt im theologischen Lichte des Spiritismus. I. Der Stern v. Bethlehem. Berlin: Aschenfeldt, 1890. Pp. 11, 8vo, 50 pf.

Murray, Jas. O., Rev., D.D. Francis Wayland. (American Religious Leaders.) New York and Boston: Houghton, M. & Co., 1891. Pp. vii., 293, 12mo, $1.25.

Newman, John Henry, Letters and Correspondence of, during his Life in the English Church. With a brief autobiography. Edited, at Cardinal Newman's request, by Anne Mosley. In two volumes. New York: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 436, 461, 12mo, $4.00.

Obel, V. Om den gammeltestamentlige Kritik. (Smaaskrifter til oplysning for kristne, udgivne af F. Nielsen, V. 6.) Kjöbenhavn: Schönberg, 1890. Pp. 106, 8vo, 1.50 kr.

Ollé-Laprune, Léon. La Philosophie et le temps présent. Paris: Berlin, 1891. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Oltramare, H. Commentaire sur les épîtres de S. Paul aux Colossiens, aux Ephésiens, et à Philémon. T. I. Paris: Fischbacker, 1891. Pp. x., 466, 8vo, 7.50 fr.

Parker, Joseph, D.D. The People's Bible. Discourses upon Holy Scripture. Vol. XIII. Proverbs. New York: Funk & W., 1891. Pp. viii., 456, 8vo, $1.50.

Paulli, J. Fader vor religiöse Betragtninger. Kjöbenhavn, 1890. Pp. 208, 8vo, 3.50 mk.

Peyras, P. La Loi juive. Étude sommaire sur les rapports de la religion judaïque avec l'organisation générique du Sémite. Toulouse: Tardieu, 1890. Pp. 8, 8vo, 50 cts.

Plummer, A. The General Epistles of St. James and St. Jude (Expositor's Bible.) London: Hodder, 1891. Pp. 480, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Pompery, Édouard de. La Morale naturelle et la Religion de l'humanité. Mesnil: Firmin-Didot, 1891. Pp. 304, 16mo.

Price, Ira M. A Syllabus of Old Testament History: Outlines and Literature. With an introductory treatment of Biblical geography. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. viii., 197, 8vo, cloth, $1.00.

Rankin, J. The Creed in Scotland: An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed. With extracts from Archbp. Hamilton's

Catechism of 1552, John Calvin's Catechism of 1556, and a Catena of ancient Latin and other hymns. Edinburgh: Blackwoods, 1890. Pp. 362, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Rawlinson, Geo., M. A., F. R. G. S. Isaac and Jacob. Their lives and times. (Men of the Bible series.) New York: Randolph, 1891. Pp. viii., 186, 12mo. cloth, $1.00.

Religion (la) basée sur la morale. Choix de discours publiés par les sociétés pour la culture morale, traduits en français avec l'autorization des auteurs et précédés d'un aperçu de l'histoire du mouvement moral. Par P. Hoffman. Paris: Fischbacker, 1891. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Robinson, J. B., D.D. The Epworth League: Its Place in Methodism. A manual, with an introduction by Rev. M. D. Carrel. Cincinnati: Cranston, 1891. Pp. 122, 16mo, cloth, 40 cts.

Roskovany, Augustinus de, Episcopus. Supplementa ad collectiones monumentorum et literaturæ: de matrimonio in ecclesia catholica potestati ecclesiasticæ subjecto; matrimoniis mixtis; cœlibatu et brevario: independentia potestatis ecclesiasticæ ab imperio civili; romano pontifice; beata Maria Virgine in suo conceptu immaculata. Tomi vii.-x. Wien: Braumüller, 1890. Pp. xxx., 761; lxx., 723; lxxviii.. 1055; cvi., 952, 8vo, each 14 mk. (Complet, i.-x., 110 mk.)

Salvation Army in Relation to the Church and State, and other Addresses delivered at Cannon Street Hotel (London) City. London: Salvation Army, 1891. Pp. 92, 8vo, 6d.

Sanday, W. The Oracles of God. Nine lectures on the nature and extent of Biblical inspiration, and on the special significance of the Old Testament Scriptures at the present time. With two appendices. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 140, 8vo, 4s.

Schaefer, Aloys, Dr. Ueber die Aufgaben der Exegese nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung. Rede. Münster: Aschendorff, 1890. Pp. 31, 8vo, 70 pf.

Schaff, Philip, D.D., LL.D. Studies in Christian Biography. Saint Chrysostom and Saint Augustin. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. viii., 158, 12mo, 75 cts.

Schmidt, H. Die Gleichnisse Jesu im Evangelium des Lukas, ausgelegt mit Rücksicht auf die socialen Aufgaben der Gegenwart Ein Sonntagsbuch über die Macht der Liebe. Basel: Reich, 1890. Pp. xli., 232. 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Scholler, L. W. Das Leiden des Gerechten. Zwei Vorträge über das Buch Hiob. Basel: Geering, 1890. Pp. 40, 8vo, 60 pf.

Scott, C. A. The Life of Abraham. (Bible Class Primers.) Edinburgh: Clark, 1891. Pp. 84, 18mo, 8d.

Secrétan, Henri. Le Pardon. Choix de discours. Paris: Grassart, 1891. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Seelye, Julius H. Our Father's Kingdom. New York: Randolph, 1891. Pp. iii., 36, 12mo, paper, 30 cts.

Sekteerer, Die russischen, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der neueren evangelischen Strömungen in der orthodoxen Kirche. Leipzig: Neumann, 1890. Pp. vii., 53, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

Sell, Karl, D.D., Ph.D. The Church in the Mirror of History. Studies on the progress of Christianity. Translated by Elizabeth Stirling. New York: Scribner, 1891. Pp. viii., 250, 12mo, $1.50.

Sermon Bible. St. Matthew xxii. to St. Mark xvi. New York: Armstrong, 1891. Pp. 389, 12mo, $1.50.

Spurgeon, C. H. Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit Sermons. Preached and revised during 1890. London: Passmore, 1891. Vol. 36. 8vo, 7s.

Starcke, A. N. La Famille primitive, ses origines, son développement. Paris: Alcan, 1891. 8vo, 6 fr.

Sterrett, J. MacBride. D.D. Reason and Authority in Religion. New York: Whittaker, 1890. Pp. xiii., 184, 12mo, $1.00.

Sterrett, J. MacBride, D.D. Studies in Hegel's Philosophy of religion. With an appendix on Christian unity in America. New York: Appleton, 1891. 12mo, cloth, $2.00.

Talmage, T. De Witt, Rev., D.D. From Manger to Throne. Embracing a new life of Jesus, the Christ, and a history of Palestine and its people. Including Dr. Talmage's account of his journey to, through, and from the Christ-Land. Philadelphia, St. Louis and Chicago: Hist. Pub. Co., 1891. Pp. 656, 8vo. Sold only by subscription.

Talmage, T. De Witt, Rev., D.D. Among the Holy Hills. Sermons principally relating to Palestine. New York: Alden, 1891. Pp. 324, 12mo, 50 cts.

Tarver, E. G. Outlines of Christian History, from the Ascension of the Lord to the Present Time. London: Frowde, 1891. 4to, 16s.

Trabaud, Henri. Essai sur les principes sociaux de l'Evangile, leur action dans l'histoire, leur application aux circonstances actuelles. Lausannes: Grassart, 1891. 8vo, 2.50 fr.

Trede, Th. Das Heidentum in der römischen Kirche. Bilder aus dem religiösen und sittlichen Leben Süditaliens. 4. und letzter Theil. Gotha: Perthes, 1891. Pp. v., 500, 8vo, 8 mk.

Trochon, C., et **Lesetre,** H. Introduction à l'étude de l'écriture sainte, d'après "la Sainte Bible avec commentaires." Tom. iii.: Introductions particulières aux livres du Nouveau Testament. Mayenne: Nezan, 1890. Pp. 568, 8vo.

Urraburu, J. J. Institutiones philosophicæ quas Romæ in pontificia universitate gregoriana tradiderat. Vol. 1. Vallisoleti, 1890. Pp. xv., 1778, 4to, 19.20 mk.

Vail, Thomas Hubbard, D.D., LL.D. Primary Doctrines. Being charges on Christian Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and on the Holy Spirit. By the late ——, Bishop of Kansas. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. 148, 12mo, 75 cts.

Vermilyea, Elizabeth B. Missionary Annuals. A series. The life of Alexander Duff. Chicago: Women's Presb. Bd. Miss. to N. W., 1891. Pp. 123, 8vo.

Volk, K. J. Entwicklungsgeschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion nach der Graf-Wellhausen'schen Hypothese. Vortrag. Karlsruhe: Reiff, 1890. Pp. 54, 8vo, 50 pf.

Whitehead, J. H. The Gospel of Jesus the Christ, according to St. Mark. Edited with notes and explanations. London: Nisbet, 1890. Pp. 86, 12mo, 1s.

Wolff, A., Rabbi. Moses, Rabbi. Sohn des Maimon (Maimonides), Mischne Thora oder Jad hachasaka, in 14 Büchern, das gesammte Gebiet der Gesetze des Judenthums umfassend, aus dem Urtexte ins Deutsche übersetzt von —. Tübingen: Fues, 1891. Pp. xxviii., 316. 8vo, 4 mk.

Wright, C. H. H. An Introduction to the Old Testament. (Theological Educator Series.) London: Hodder, 1891. Pp. 242, 12mo, 2s. 6d.

Zöckler, O. Die Apokryphen des Alten Testaments, nebst einem Anhang über die Pseudepigraphenlitteratur. (Kurzgefasster Kommentar, 9. Abtheilung.) München: Beck, 1890. Pp. xi., 495, 8vo, 8 mk.

NOTES ON THE PERIODICALS.

The English monthlies for February lead in interest, though some of them arrived too late to make selections for the current number of this magazine. "Cardinal Newman's Scepticism," by Leslie Stephen, and "Professor Huxley and the Swine Miracle," by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, are the chief features of the *Nineteenth Century*; but to these may be added, "The Tyranny of the 'Nonconformist Conscience,'" by the Hon. Reginald B. Brett—though, to speak plainly, the discussion is inspired by politics rather than religion.—The *Contemporary Review*, in addition to the article of Principal Fairbairn reprinted this month, contains a remarkable paper by Count Leo Tolstoi, on "The Ethics of Wine-Drinking and Tobacco-Smoking," in which the author contends that men use wine and tobacco to blunt their consciences that they may sin more comfortably. "Ancient Church Endowments," by Dr. Edward A. Freeman, and "The Realities of Christianity," by Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, are also articles of value.—"Child Marriage in India," by C. N. Barham, is the leading article of the *Westminster Review*, and the only one of special note.—Readers will wonder how the article on "Public Life and Private Morals" came to be published in the *Fortnightly Review* at all, inasmuch as its main contention is that adultery is a venial offence, that ought not to disqualify a public man for a continued career. Though signed "M.," simply, the author is understood to be W. H. Mallock. It is perhaps appropriate that a companion article in the same number is "The Soul of Man Under Socialism," by Oscar Wilde.

The *Canadian Methodist Quarterly* for January contains "A Plan of Bible Study for Sunday-schools," by Professor William R. Harper, Ph.D., well worthy of wide reading; and D. D. G. Sunderland's discussion of "The Methodist Liturgy," touches a living question.—Three articles in the *Cumberland Presbyterian Review* will attract attention, because of their bearing on questions of the day: "Relation of the Church to Popular Amusements," by J. F. Rogers; "The Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor," by J. W. Loughlin, and "The American Sabbath," by H. D. Onyett.—No one who has the opportunity should fail to read "The Bennett Law—Compulsory Education in Wisconsin," by Isaac Thomas, in the February *New Englander*.—In the *Andover Review* for February will be found two articles of more than ordinary value: "Papal Infallibility in the Light of History," by Professor H. C. Sheldon, and "The Theology of a Sacred Day," by Rev. George F. Genung.

BR Christian literature
1
C635
v.3

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY